38795
LS70.2
CC
1875
AUTHOR
urch Congress
TLE
t of the proceedings
UE
BORROWER'S NAME
DENNIS DUFACLA 845-6000
410 HEARST M.B.
IC BERK. x3804
CBGTU
.2
5
Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific
NO. 4

AUTHORISED REPORT

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS,

1875.

The following Papers are Published separately:—

PERSONAL HOLINESS AS INFLUENCING CONDUCT IN SOCIETY. By the DEAN OF LICHFIELD. 32mo. 1d. 5s. per 100.

PERSONAL HOLINESS AS INFLUENCING CONDUCT IN THE FAMILY. By EARL NELSON. 2d.

PERSONAL HOLINESS AS INFLUENCING CONDUCT IN TRADE. By GEORGE SKEY, Esq. 2d.

POPULAR ARGUMENTS OF UNBELIEF, AND HOW TO MEET THEM. By ARCHDEACON REICHEL. 2d.

SCEPTICISM AMONG THE WORKING CLASSES. By the Rev. V. H. STANTON, M.A. 2d.

FUNERAL REFORM. By the Rev. Dr COLLIS. 2d.

AUTHORISED REPORT

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS

HELD AT STOKE-UPON-TRENT

OCTOBER 5, 6, 7, & 8

1875

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

LONDON
WILLIAM WELLS GARDNER
SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS

LS70.2
CC
1875

PREFACE.

The Authorised Report of the Fifteenth Church Congress, held at Stoke-upon-Trent, October 5–8, 1875, so far exceeds its predecessors in bulk, that anything like a lengthy Preface must be dispensed with.

The Committee are too deeply indebted to those whose thoughts on many of the most difficult Church questions of the day are contained in this volume to make it a ground of complaint that some of the papers have outrun their appointed limits. But to this must be attributed both the delay in the publication of the Report, and a large additional charge by the publisher for excess of matter, which at this date leaves the account for the year unclosed.

So much was said, and so kindly, by various Speakers at the Final Meeting as to the successful character of this Congress, that the Committee forbear adding anything to it, lest it should savour of self-praise. For all that was well done they desire humbly to thank Almighty God, Whose good Spirit was manifestly present in answer to prayer. All who attended the Congress will unite in acknowledging how much, under God, was due to the tact and courteous firmness of the Right Reverend President, Bishop Selwyn. He was happy in being able to say, before vacating the Chair, that "they had spent four whole days listening to words of wisdom, without a single word of strife or bitterness."

Falling far below the four preceding meetings in the number of members enrolled, the Stoke Congress has enjoyed the pre-eminence in the number of Day and Evening Tickets sold. Perhaps no Congress has made its influence more widely felt in the town and neighbourhood in which it has been held, and none has attracted a larger attendance of the middle and working classes. The omission from the usual programme of the "Working-Men's Meeting," with free admission, proved

38795

no detriment; and the sale of Evening Tickets, averaging 1100 a night, showed conclusively the interest felt in the Congress by those who were employed during the day. In consideration of the peculiarities of the district, which contains several large detached towns, the Committee arranged a series of "Free Sectional Meetings," at which well-known members of the Congress delivered addresses on popular questions of the day; and these were held in Hanley, Longton, Burslem, Tunstall, Newcastle, and Silverdale, and were numerously attended. In the Parish Church of Stoke there were also Special Evening Services, with sermons by preachers of note.

By these various arrangements every part of the district was identified with the Church Congress of 1875.

To this must be attributed the readiness with which the Guarantee List was filled up. It was clear from the first that there must be a heavy deficiency, and the Committee appealed for a guarantee of £2000. The sum actually guaranteed, in various sums ranging from £100 to £1, 1s., was £1847, 16s.; and donations were received amounting to £151, 18s. 4d. A call for 10s. in the pound was promptly met by the Guarantors; and if it had not been for the unexpected charge already alluded to, the large expenditure of £2219, 12s. 1d. would have been fully covered.

It would be ungracious if the Committee omitted to record the generous hospitality which was forthcoming on all hands, and was offered by Nonconformists as well as by Churchmen. Indeed, the chief disappointment was, that there were not more visitors from a distance to avail themselves of it.

These facts must always make the Stoke Church Congress a happy retrospect; and its effects upon the neighbourhood, stimulating Church feeling and diffusing Church information, will not soon be effaced.

CHURCH CONGRESS, 1875.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING,

HELD AT STOKE-UPON-TRENT,

On Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, October 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th.

Patron.

THE RIGHT HON. AND MOST REV. THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

President.

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.

Vice-Presidents.

CLERGY.

THE RIGHT HON. AND MOST REV. THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

The Lord Archbishop of Armagh
The Lord Archbishop of Dublin
The Lord Bishop of Winchester
The Lord Bishop of Bangor
The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells
The Lord Bishop of Carlisle
The Lord Bishop of Chester
The Lord Bishop of Chichester
The Lord Bishop of Ely
The Lord Bishop of Glo'ster and Bristol.
The Lord Bishop of Hereford
The Lord Bishop of Llandaff
The Lord Bishop of Manchester
The Lord Bishop of Oxford
The Lord Bishop of Peterborough
The Lord Bishop of Ripon
The Lord Bishop of Rochester
The Lord Bishop of Salisbury
The Lord Bishop of St David's
The Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man
The Lord Bishop of Meath
The Lord Bishop of Cork
The Lord Bishop of Derry
The Lord Bishop of Kilmore
The Lord Bishop of Limerick
The Lord Bishop of Tuam
The Lord Bishop of Moray and Ross
The Lord Bishop of Argyll
The Lord Bishop of Edinburgh
The Lord Bishop of Glasgow
The Lord Bishop of St Andrew's
The Lord Bishop of Melbourne
The Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham
The Bishop Suffragan of Guildford
The Right Rev. Bishop Hobhouse
The Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of York
The Very Rev. the Dean of Lichfield
The Very Rev. the Dean of Chester
The Very Rev. the Dean of Manchester
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Stafford
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Derby
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Salop
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Chester
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Ely*
The Rev. Canon Lonsdale
The Rev. Canon Curteis
The Rev. the Earl of Mulgrave
The Rev. the Hon. G. T. O. Bridgeman
The Rev. Dr Fraser

* Permanent Secretary to the Church Congress.

LAITY.

The High Sheriff of Staffordshire (Lieut.-Colonel Bagnall)
The Lord-Lieutenant of Staffordshire (Lord Wrottesley)
The Duke of Devonshire, K.G.
The Duke of Sutherland, K.G.
The Marquis of Stafford, M.P.
The Earl of Shrewsbury and Talbot
The Earl of Harrowby, K.G.
The Earl of Dartmouth
The Earl of Lichfield
Right Hon. Viscount Sandon, M.P.
Lord Crewe
Lord Hatherton
Right Hon. Sir C. B. Adderley, M.P.
Right Hon. C. P. Villiers, M.P.
The Hon. and Worshipful R. C. Herbert
Sir E. Manningham Buller, Bart.
Sir T. P. Heywood, Bart.
S. C. Allsopp, Esq., M.P.
F. Monckton, Esq., M.P.
C. M. Campbell, Esq., M.P.
R. Hanbury, Esq., M.P.
T. Salt, Esq., M.P.
R. Heath, Esq., M.P.
The Mayor of Stoke-upon-Trent (C. Dickinson, Esq.)
The Mayor of Newcastle (W. O. Briggs, Esq.)
The Mayor of Hanley (H. Cartledge, Esq.)
The Mayor of Longton (A. Edwards, Esq.)

Executive Committee.

Chairman: The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of LICHFIELD.

Vice-Chairman: C. M. Campbell, Esq., M.P.

Treasurer: T. W. Minton, Esq.

CLERGY.

Right Rev. Bishop Hobhouse
Right Rev. Bishop Staley
Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of York
Very Rev. the Dean of Manchester
Very Rev. the Dean of Chester
Venerable Archdeacon Moore
Venerable Archdeacon Allen
Venerable Archdeacon Balston
Venerable Archdeacon Johnson
Rev. Canon Curteis
Rev. Canon Lonsdale
Rev. Canon Lowe
Rev. Prebendary Bolton
Rev. Prebendary Edwards
Rev. Prebendary Harland
Rev. Prebendary Iles
Rev. Prebendary Lloyd
Rev. Prebendary Walsh.
Rev. Canon Birley
Rev. Canon Cornish
Rev. Canon Clayton
Rev. Canon Hornby
Rev. Canon Ram
Rev. H. Abud
Rev. the Hon. A. Anson
Rev. H. Bolland.
Rev. F. G. Blackburne
Rev. E. D. Boothman
Rev. A. Clarke
Rev. R. W. Corbet
Rev. J. Ellerton
Rev. T. F. Fenn
Rev. G. A. Festing
Rev. R. M. Grier
Rev. H. Harvey
Rev. R. Hawes
Rev. W. H. F. Hepworth
Rev. Dr Huckin
Rev. W. Hutchinson
Rev. C. B. Jackson
Rev. E. Lane
Rev. Dr Massingham
Rev. W. Moss
Rev. H. Meynell
Rev. D. R. Norman
Rev. C. F. C. Pigott
Rev. B. Pidcock
Rev. W. P. Vincent

LAITY.

The Earl of Shrewsbury and Talbot
The Earl of Lichfield
The Earl of Harrowby, K.G.
Right Hon. Viscount Sandon, M.P.
Right Hon. Sir C. B. Adderley, M.P.
A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.
Sir T. P. Heywood, Bart.
Sir John Morris
T. Salt, Esq., M.P.
C. Adams, Esq.
W. Adams, Esq.
J. T. Arlidge, Esq., M.D.
C. Bill, Esq.
F. Stanier-Broade, Esq.
C. J. Blagg, Esq.
W. O. Briggs, Esq.
H. H. Bemrose, Esq.
W. H. Bishop, Esq.
John Borough, Esq.
M. F. Blakiston, Esq.
R. Clive, Esq.
W. H. Cresswell, Esq.

S. H. Cooper, Esq.
H. Cartledge, Esq.
E. Challinor, Esq.
J. Challinor, Esq.
C. Daniel, Esq.
C. Dickinson, Esq.
H. C. Greenwood, Esq.
C. Haywood, Esq.
M. D. Hollins, Esq.
G. Jones, Esq.
W. Keary, Esq.
T. J. Keeling, Esq.
J. N. Langley, Esq.
O. Lodge, Esq.
C. Lynam, Esq.
C. B. May, Esq.
C. M. Osmond, Esq.
J. W. Philips, Esq.
E. J. Ridgway, Esq.
J. Samuda, Esq.
G. Skey, Esq.
W. Spooner, Esq.
G. Webber, Esq.
L. Wedgwood, Esq.

Rev. Sir L. T. Stamer, Bart.,
Rev. C. W. Bond,
Rev. J. T. Jeffcock,
Rev. R. Boughey,
Herbert Minton, Esq.,
F. S. Bishop, Esq.,
H. T. Davenport, Esq.
Taylor Ashworth, Esq.
} *Hon. Secretaries.*

*** The Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Treasurer, and Hon. Secretaries are ex-officio Members of all Committees.

RULES OF PROCEEDING.

After the Papers and Addresses of the appointed Readers and Speakers, there will be free and open debate under the following Regulations :—

(1.)—None but Members of the Church of England, or of Churches in communion with it, will be permitted to address the Congress, and no person will be permitted to speak twice on the same subject.

(2.)—All questions of Order of Proceedings will be in the discretion of the President, or presiding Chairman, whose decision will be final.

(3.)—Any Member desirous of addressing the Congress on the subject before the Meeting must give his card to the Secretary in attendance, and await the call of the Chairman.

(4.)—Every Speaker shall address the Chair only, and confine himself strictly to the subject under discussion.

(5.)—No question arising out of any Paper or Subject shall be put to the Vote.

Prayers and Hymns to be used at the Meetings.

PRAYERS.

(At each Meeting of the Congress.)

LET US PRAY.

Lord, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.

Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation: but deliver us from evil: for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. AMEN.

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy Holy Name; through Christ our Lord. AMEN.

Almighty and everlasting God, by whose Spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified; receive our supplications and prayers which we offer before Thee for all estates of men in Thy Holy Church, that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve Thee; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. AMEN.

Grant, O Lord, we beseech Thee, that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by Thy governance, that Thy Church may joyfully serve Thee in all godly quietness; through Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.

Almighty God, the Giver of all good gifts, vouchsafe Thy blessing to the Church Congress at this time here assembled. Guide and govern the minds of its members, so that all things may be ordered for the increase of its usefulness, and for the edification of Thy Church. Give a large measure of Thy Holy Spirit to those who are called to take a part in its discussions; to Thy servant the presiding Bishop, and to all the Clergy and Laity who are met together under him. Control all unruly wills and affections, and take away from us whatever may hinder us from godly union and concord. O Lord, may Thy grace prevent and follow us in all we undertake for Thee: and make us continually to bring forth the fruit of good works, that by Thee we may be plenteously rewarded, through Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. AMEN.

HYMNS.

1. "*The Comforter, Which is the Holy Ghost.*"

COME, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,
And lighten with celestial fire;
Thou the anointing Spirit art,
Who dost Thy sevenfold gifts impart:

Thy blessed unction from above
Is comfort, life, and fire of love;
Enable with perpetual light
The dulness of our blinded sight:

Anoint and cheer our soiled face
With the abundance of Thy grace:
Keep far our foes, give peace at home;
Where Thou art Guide no ill can come.

Teach us to know the Father, Son,
And Thee, of Both, to be but One;
That through the ages all along
This may be our endless song,

Praise to Thy eternal merit,
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen.

2. "*And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.*"

Gracious Spirit, Holy Ghost,
Taught by Thee, we covet most,
Of Thy gifts at Pentecost,
Holy, heavenly Love.

Love is kind and suffers long,
Love is meek, and thinks no wrong,
Love than death itself more strong,
Therefore give us Love.

Prophecy will fade away,
Melting in the light of day;
Love will ever with us stay;
Therefore give us Love.

Faith will vanish into sight;
Hope be emptied in delight;
Love in heaven will shine more bright;
Therefore give us Love.

Faith and Hope and Love we see
Joining hand in hand agree;
But the greatest of the three,
And the best, is Love.

From the overshadowing
Of Thy gold and silver wing
Shed on us, who to Thee sing,
Holy, heavenly Love. Amen.

3. "*Thy kingdom come.*"

Thy kingdom come, O God;
Thy rule, O Christ, begin;
Break with Thine iron rod
The tyrannies of sin.

Where is Thy reign of peace,
And purity, and love?
When shall all hatred cease,
As in the realms above?

When comes the promised time
That war shall be no more,
And lust, oppression, crime,
Shall flee Thy face before?

We pray Thee, Lord, arise,
And come in Thy great might;
Revive our longing eyes,
Which languish for Thy sight.

Men scorn Thy sacred Name,
And wolves devour Thy fold;
By many deeds of shame
We learn that love grows cold.

O'er heathen lands afar
Thick darkness broodeth yet:
Arise, O morning star,
Arise, and never set. Amen.

4. "*One hope of our calling.*"

Through the night of doubt and sorrow
Onward goes the pilgrim band,
Singing songs of expectation,
Marching to the Promised Land.

Clear before us through the darkness
Gleams and burns the guiding Light;
Brother clasps the hand of brother,
Stepping fearless through the night.

One the Light of God's own Presence
O'er His ransomed people shed,
Chasing far the gloom and terror,
Brightening all the path we tread:

One the object of our journey,
One the faith which never tires,
One the earnest looking forward,
One the hope our God inspires:

One the strain that lips of thousands
Lift as from the heart of one;
One the conflict, one the peril,
One the march in God begun:

One the gladness of rejoicing
On the far eternal shore,
Where the One Almighty Father
Reigns in love for evermore.

Onward therefore, pilgrim brothers,
Onward with the Cross our aid!
Bear its shame, and fight its battle,
Till we rest beneath its shade.

Soon shall come the great awaking,
Soon the rending of the tomb;
Then the scattering of all shadows,
And the end of toil and gloom. Amen.

5. "*That Rock was Christ.*"

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee;
Let the water and the blood,
From Thy riven side which flowed,
Be of sin the double cure,
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.

Not the labours of my hands
Can fulfil Thy law's demands;
Could my zeal no respite know,
Could my tears for ever flow,
All for sin could not atone;
Thou must save, and Thou alone.

Nothing in my hand I bring,
Simply to Thy Cross I cling;
Naked, come to Thee for dress;
Helpless, look to Thee for grace;
Foul, I to the Fountain fly;
Wash me, Saviour, or I die.

While I draw this fleeting breath,
When my eyelids close in death,
When I soar through tracts unknown,
See Thee on Thy judgment throne;
Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee. Amen.

6. "*Thy Word is a lantern unto my feet, and a light unto my path.*"

Lord, Thy Word abideth,
And our footsteps guideth;
Who its truth believeth
Light and joy receiveth.

When our foes are near us,
Then Thy Word doth cheer us,
Word of consolation,
Message of salvation.

When the storms are o'er us,
And dark clouds before us,
Then its light directeth,
And our way protecteth.

Who can tell the pleasure,
Who recount the treasure,
By Thy Word imparted
To the simple-hearted;

Word of mercy, giving
Succour to the living;
Word of life, supplying
Comfort to the dying!

O that we discerning
Its most holy learning,
Lord, may love and fear Thee,
Evermore be near Thee. Amen.

7. "*When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.*"

As with gladness men of old,
Did the guiding star behold,
As with joy they hailed its light,
Leading onward, beaming bright;
So, most gracious Lord, may we
Evermore be led to Thee.

As with joyful steps they sped,
Saviour, to Thy lowly bed,
There to bend the knee before
Thee Whom heaven and earth adore;
So may we with willing feet
Ever seek the mercy-seat.

As they offered gifts most rare
At Thy cradle rude and bare;
So may we with holy joy,
Pure and free from sin's alloy,
All our costliest treasures bring,
Christ, to Thee our heavenly King.

Holy Jesus, every day
Keep us in the narrow way;
And, when earthly things are past,
Bring our ransomed souls at last
Where they need no star to guide,
Where no clouds Thy glory hide.

In the heavenly country bright
Need they no created light;
Thou its Light, its Joy, its Crown,
Thou its Sun which goes not down—
There for ever may we sing
Alleluias to our King. Amen.

1875.—Church Services during the Four Days, October 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th.

STOKE PARISH CHURCH.—7.30 a.m., Holy Communion; 9.15 a.m., Morning Prayer; 6.15 p.m., Evening Prayer.

SHELTON, ST MARK'S.—6 and 7.15 a.m., Holy Communion; 6 p.m., Evensong.

HANLEY, ST JOHN'S.—7.30 a.m., Holy Communion.

NORTHWOOD.—7.30 a.m., Holy Communion.

LONGTON, ST JAMES'.—8 a.m., Holy Communion on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, Morning Prayer on Tuesday and Thursday.

DRESDEN.—7 a.m., Holy Communion; 9 a.m., Morning Prayer.

FENTON.—8 am., Morning Prayer.

HARTSHILL.—8 a.m., Holy Communion on Tuesday: other days Morning Prayer.

BURSLEM, HOLY TRINITY (SNEYD).—6.45 and 7.45 a.m., Holy Communion.

WOLSTANTON.—7.15 a.m., Holy Communion.

LEEK, ST LUKE'S.—7.45 a.m., Morning Prayer.

RUGELEY.—7.30 a.m., Holy Communion.

STAFFORD.—7.30 a.m., Holy Communion.

UTTOXETER.—8.30 a.m., Morning Prayer.

On Saturday, October 9th, there was a special Service in Lichfield Cathedral at 10.30 a.m.; *Preacher:*—THE VERY REV. E. BICKERSTETH, D.D., *Dean of Lichfield and Prolocutor.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5.

PAGE

SERMON, by the Bishop of Rochester 3
by the Bishop of Ontario . 15
INAUGURAL ADDRESS, by the Bishop of Lichfield 23

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCHES IN COMMUNION WITH HER:—

PAPERS:—The Bishop of Edinburgh 30
The Bishop of Melbourne . 35
Rev. Lord Plunket . . 40
ADDRESS:—Bishop of Tennessee . 46
DISCUSSION:—Mr T. F. Dickinson . 48
Rev. Dr Potter . . . 49
Mr Beresford Hope, M.P. . 51
Archdeacon Reichel . . 51

WOMAN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH:—

PAPERS:—Rev. T. T. Carter . . 52
Rev. Canon Gore . . 56
Miss Yonge . . . 61
Mr C. Baynes . . . 67
DISCUSSION:—Rev. Canon Tristram 71
Rev. C. F. Lowder . . 72
Archdeacon Ffoulkes . . 73
Rev. W. Cadman . . 74

WHAT CAN THE CHURCH DO TO COUNTERACT DRUNKENNESS?—

President 75
PAPERS:—Sir H. Johnstone, M.P. . 75
Rev. Basil Wilberforce . 78
Sir Wilfred Lawson, M.P. . 84
ADDRESS:—Mr Mark Knowles . 86
DISCUSSION:—Dean of Manchester 88
Mr J. Hawkins] 89
Rev. E. R. Wilberforce . 90
Rev. Prebendary Harland . 2
Rev. W. E. Littlewood . . 92

PAGE

Rev. R. O. Assheton . . 93
Rev. T. Bennett . . . 93
Rev. R. M. Grier . . 94

CHARITY ORGANISATION:—

Chairman (Mr Dimmock) . 95
PAPERS:—Mr H. Longley . . 96
Rev. J. F. Kitto . . . 101
ADDRESS:—Mr C. B. P. Bosanquet 106
DISCUSSION:—Commander Dawson 106
Rev. Prebendary Edwards . 107
Chairman 108

CHURCH WORK AMONG BOATMEN:—

PAPERS:—Rev. Canon Barclay . 109
Commander Dawson . . 113
DISCUSSION:—Rev. T. W. Carr . 119
Rev. R. M. Herdman . . 119
Rev. Dr Gott . . . 120
Rev. T. Tomlinson . . 121

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 6.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION:—

PAPERS:—Rev. W. J. Kennedy . 122
Mr Hugh Birley, M.P. . 128
Rev. E. Jackson . . . 135
ADDRESS:—Rev. Canon Melville . 139
DISCUSSION:—Rev. W. Cadman . 142
Mr C. Bushell . . . 143
Rev. Canon Money . . 145
Mr Holmes . . . 146
Rev. Canon Barry . . 146
Rev. Dr Marshall . . 147
Rev. H. Bowlby . . . 148
Rev. Evan Daniel . . 149
Rev. J. M. Du Port . . 150
Rev. J. Sweet . . . 151
Rev. W. M. Ben-Oliel . 152
Rev. C. F. Lowder . . 152
Rev. Canon How . . 153

PAGE

Rev. H. K. Eaton . . 154
Mr T. F. Dickinson . . 155
Dean of Chester . . . 155
Earl of Harrowby . . 156

ECCLESIASTICAL DILAPIDATIONS :—

PAPERS :—Rev. Dr Fraser . . 156
Mr R. R. Rowe . . . 160
ADDRESS :—Rev. Dr Massingham . 166
DISCUSSION :—Mr C. Lynam . . 170
Rev. Canon Tristram . . 171
Archdeacon Emery . . 172
Rev. C. F. C. Pigott . . 172
Rev. D. Mountfield . . 173
Rev. D. R. Norman . . 174

FREE AND OPEN CHURCHES :—

PAPERS :—Dean of York . . . 175
Earl of Shrewsbury . . 179
ADDRESSES :—Sir T. P. Heywood . 184
Mr J. Croston . . . 186
DISCUSSION :—Bishop of Melbourne 188
Mr Herford 188
Rev. Dr Perowne . . 189
Earl Nelson 190
Sir Antonio Brady . . 191

MISSIONS AND MISSIONARY BISHOPRICS :—

PAPERS :—Rev. T. V. French . . 192
Rev. D. Fenn . . . 199
Rev. Dr W. Stevens Perry . 204
ADDRESSES :—Rev. H. Rowley . 210
Rev. J. Higgins . . . 213
DISCUSSION :—Earl Nelson . . 217
Rev. G. T. Carruthers . 218
Captain Maude . . . 219
Rev. T. O. Marshall . . 220
Bishop of Melbourne . . 222
President 223

FUNERAL REFORM :—

PAPERS :—Rev. Dr Collis . . 224
Rev. James Davies . . 230
DISCUSSION :—Dr Joseph Allen . 235
Rev. T. Bennett . . . 236
Hon. W. Warren-Vernon . 237
Rev. C. F. Lowder . . 237
Mr Beresford Hope, M.P. . 238
Rev. R. R. Bristow . . 239
Captain G. E. W. Malet . 240
Earl of Shrewsbury . . 241

PAGE

CHURCH WORK AMONG DEAF AND DUMB :—

PAPERS :—Rev. S. Smith . . . 241
Dr Buxton 249
ADDRESS :—Rev. G. A. W. Downing 253
DISCUSSION :—Mr Croston . . 255
Mr Foulston . . . 256

POPULAR ARGUMENTS OF UNBELIEF AND HOW TO MEET THEM :—

PAPERS :—Rev. V. H. Stanton . 258
Archdeacon Reichel . . 263
Mr R. H. Hutton . . 270
ADDRESS :—Rev. R. Maguire . . 276
DISCUSSION :—Rev. J. W. Bardsley 278
Rev. Canon Titcomb . . 280
Rev. Canon How . . 281
Rev. E. W. Randall . . 282

CHURCH WORK IN THE ARMY :—

PAPERS :—Bishop Piers Claughton . 284
Archdeacon Wright . . 287
Rev. J. C. Edghill . . 296
ADDRESS :—Farrier-Major Terry . 303
DISCUSSION :—Capt. G. E. W. Malet 305
Rev. W. Caine . . . 307
Rev. G. T. Carruthers . 307
Rev. R. R. Bristow . . 308

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7.

LAY AGENCY :—

PAPERS :—Rev. Dr Marshall . . 309
Mr L. Samson . . . 314
Bishop of Carlisle . . 320
Rev. Canon How . . 324
ADDRESS :—Mr T. Salt, M.P. . . 328
DISCUSSION :—Rev. J. W. Bardsley 330
Rev. G. Williams . . 332
Rev. E. A. Hillyard . . 332
Mr C. C. Walker . . 333
President 334
Rev. H. Bowlby . . . 334
Colonel Bagnall . . . 335
Rev. B. F. Smith . . 336
Rev. J. F. Kitto . . 336
Rev. W. Caine . . . 337
Mr C. Baynes . . . 337
Bishop of Bangor . . 338

PAGE

RECENT LEGISLATION AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN OUR UNIVERSITIES:—

PAPERS:—Rev. Dr Perowne . . 339
Rev. W. Ince . . . 345
ADDRESS:—Rev. W. A. Spooner . 351
DISCUSSION:—Rev. A. M. W. Christopher 353
Archdeacon Reichel . . 354
Rev. V. H. Stanton . . 355
Archdeacon Emery . . 357

RECENT LEGISLATION AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN OUR HIGHER SCHOOLS:—

PAPERS:—Rev. Canon Cornish . 358
Rev. H. W. Moss . . 363
ADDRESS:—Rev. Canon Barry . 366
DISCUSSION:—Rev. Mr Anderson . 368
Mr Beresford Hope, M.P. . 369

REVIVAL MOVEMENTS:—

PAPERS:—Rev. R. Twigg . . 371
Mr W. T. Paton . . . 376
Rev. J. Oakley . . . 381
ADDRESSES:—Mr N. Sherbrooke . 392
Rev. R. M. Grier . . 394
DISCUSSION:—Rev. J. G. M. Townsend 396
Rev. C. F. Lowder . . 397
Rev. G. W. Weldon . . 398
Dr Allen 399
Archdeacon Reichel . . 399
Rev. E. H. Bickersteth . 400
Archdeacon Emery . . 401
Earl of Harrowby . . 401

ORGANISATION OF THE EPISCOPATE WITH CAPITULAR AND CATHEDRAL INSTITUTIONS:—

PAPERS:—Mr Beresford Hope, M.P. 403
Dean of Chester . . . 407
DISCUSSION:—Rev. Canon Tristram 408
Mr T. F. Dickinson . . 409
Chairman 410
Archdeacon Wright . . 411
Rev. R. G. L. Blenkinsopp 411

SUPPLY OF CLERGY:—

PAPERS:—Rev. Canon Curteis . 412
Rev. A. M. W. Christopher 417
DISCUSSION:—Rev. W. R. Cosens . 424
Rev. Dr Girdlestone . . 425
Rev. S. Andrew . . . 426
Archdeacon Ffoulkes . . 427
Rev. W. Caine . . . 428

PAGE

RECENT EXPLORATIONS IN BIBLE LANDS:—

PAPERS:—Rev. F. W. Holland . 429
Captain Warren . . . 436
Rev. G. Williams . . 443
Rev. Canon Tristram . . 448
President 453

CHILDREN'S SERVICES:—

PAPERS:—Rev. H. Brass . . . 454
Rev. G. Everard . . 459
ADDRESS:—Archdeacon Emery . 466
DISCUSSION:—Rev. E. A. Hillyard . 467
Rev. J. F. Kitto . . 468
Rev. Evan Daniel . . 468
Rev. R. W. Randall . . 469

SPECIAL PREACHERS:—

PAPERS:—Rev. Canon Titcomb . 470
Rev. W. H. Hutchings . 473
DISCUSSION:—Rev. D. R. Norman . 481
Rev. R. R. Bristow . . 481
Rev. R. W. Randall . . 482
Archdeacon Emery . . 482
Chairman (Bishop of Bloemfontein) 483

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8.

PERSONAL HOLINESS:—

President 484
PAPERS:—Earl Nelson . . . 484
Rev. E. H. Bickersteth . 490
Rev. H. M. Villiers . . 494
Dean of Lichfield . . 499
Mr S. A. Blackwood . . 502
Rev. Canon Money . . 505
Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton 510
Mr G. Skey . . . 518

RELIGIOUS AND DEVOTIONAL BOOKS:—

PAPERS:—Rev. Canon King . . 523
Rev. G. E. Jelf . . . 529
Rev. Dr Farrar . . . 534
Mr J. M. Clabon . . 540
ADDRESS:—Rev. F. F. Goe . . 545
DISCUSSION:—Rev. T. Barker . . 546
Rev. Canon Tristram . . 547
Bishop of Melbourne . . 548
Dean of Chester . . . 549

PAGE

Rev. G. Everard . . 550
Rev. R. W. Randall . . 551

PASTORAL WORK:—

PAPERS:—Archdeacon Blunt . . 552
Rev. Prebendary Cadman . 558
Rev. E. T. Leeke . . 563
DISCUSSION:—Rev. H. T. Fontaine 568
Rev. Dr Massingham . . 569
Captain F. Maude . . 570
Rev. T. Bennett . . . 572
Rev. H. Bowlby . . 573
Rev. J. Jordan . . . 574
Rev. F. H. Cox . . . 575
Mr E. B. Birks . . . 576
Rev. Cave Brown Cave . 576

PAGE

HYMNS AND HYMN-SINGING:—

Archdeacon Emery . . 578
Mayor of Stoke . . . 579
The President . . . 579
Earl Nelson . . . 580
Mayor of Stoke . . . 580
Mr Higgins . . . 581
Rev. E. H. Bickersteth . 582
Rev. R. W. Randall . . 582
Mayor of Newcastle . . 583
Rev. Sir L. T. Stamer . 583

FINAL MEETING:—

PAPERS:—Rev. J. Ellerton . . 584
Rev. S. J. Stone . . 588
Mr E. J. Hopkins . . 592
President 599

SRMMON by the DEAN OF LICHFIELD 601

APPENDIX.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 605
LIST OF GUARANTORS 606
DONORS 608

THE SERMON

PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH, STOKE-UPON-TRENT,

On Tuesday, October 5th, 1875,

BY THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

THE SERMON

BY THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

"But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal."—1 Cor. xii. 7.

Outside her established and ordinary councils, and independently of them, the Church has resorted in these days of free discussion to Church Congresses, wherein her members, lay and clerical, may interchange the sentiments and opinions to which, on all subjects connected with the organisation and life of the body, this free discussion hath given birth.

Often as it has been said, "They are too frequent, they encourage strife and contention rather than compose it; they would serve the same purpose better at longer intervals of time; they occur sometimes at critical periods, when silence were safer than debate; fit places cannot be found where they may be held with advantage; some of our Bishops are opposed to them, as interfering with the ordinary work of the ministry; it were better that our pastors were in their own parsonages, giving themselves to the ministry of the Word and to prayer"—often, I say, as these things have been thought and said, there has been an unbroken succession of annual Congresses from the year when they were first conceived to the present time.

Every one of these objections has found its solution in the conviction felt at the close of each Congress, that opinions are rife which must have this as their natural and proper expression, under the control of a wisely-exercised authority; that in every part of the country there are places which may be benefitted by such expression of opinion within the hearing of the dwellers in those parts; that the work will not be done until a

Congress has been held in each great centre, whether commercial, agricultural, or, as here, where thousands are employed in manufacture—or in our seats of learning, or even in our places of resort for health and refreshment—until men meeting face to face with those who widely differ from them even on essential points shall have learnt from mutual experience, that though there are diversities of gifts, and operations, and ministrations, yet in all these one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every man severally as He will.

This is the principle which ought to underlie all we think, or do, or say. The gift of the Spirit, or, as it is here said, "the manifestation of the Spirit," is given to every man to profit withal—not for himself, but with a view to the profit of the whole body. To boast in any wise as though we had not received our gift from Him who divideth to every man severally as He will, to be puffed up for one against another, as though the manifestation in any one were of the nature of an achievement by himself, so as to lead him to glory in it even while he knows his own insufficiency, this, as we all know, is evil, and nothing but evil can come of it. And if these great assemblies promoted this, instead of (as I humbly believe and trust they do) correcting it, it were far better they should be discontinued.

If we are to come away from them with the feeling in our mind or the word on our lips, "Such a one—or such a party—had the best of it," as a matter of rivalry or competition—then, indeed, should we come together not for the better but for the worse. But if our hearts' desire is to sift the questions which concern the Church's welfare in the days in which we live, and to gather from the experience of others guidance for ourselves which may help us, on our return to our several spheres of work, to set forth our Master's glory by new vigour, new wisdom, revived faith, increased knowledge—then we may humbly hope that our assembling together is not in vain. Brethren, I think I may say for this assembly—indeed, I think I may say it for any assembly of believers held in these times—that the one desire of their hearts, the feeling uppermost in their minds when they kneel down to pray for God's blessing on their undertaking, on whatever they shall think, or speak, or do, is that He would pour into their own hearts and the hearts of all His most blessed gift of charity—that He would inspire them with the holy

feeling which the Royal Psalmist expressed in those words—"Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." May we never once in all our deliberations give utterance to one single sentiment opposed to that spirit. It is a great thing to ask and hope; but faith may ask and shall prevail also. May we have it impressed on all our hearts that we are the Body of Christ, and members in particular; that none can say to another, I have no need of you.

The revival of religion in our time is remarkable, not only in the direction of a higher faith and devotion, but in that of regarding the Church as an organisation, as the Body of Christ. Men walk about Zion, and go round about her, and tell her towers, and mark her bulwarks. There is a longing for unity; men are conscious to themselves that the army of the Lord ought, as any other army, to be led against the Lord's enemies either under one, or under thoroughly agreed commanders; that there should not be this distraction of various opinions, conflicting views. Witness the Vatican Council, the Pan-Anglican Synod, the Bonn Conference, the Evangelical Alliance. What do these various movements indicate but a deep desire for unity? Each sets forth its own remedy for the deep-seated grievance of which all are conscious. From the Latins and old imperial Rome comes the unconditional demand for subjection to an infallible "Imperator" of the Church. And they say that the spirit which refuses to accept the demand is the spirit of the world and of Antichrist. We know and feel in all our hearts that the assertion cannot be admitted. From the Protestant communities which reject the idea of one visible Body of Christ comes the suggestion, which is really as untenable, though not so offensive, as the former, that we should agree to differ in faith, be united only in love, which is directly in opposition to the words of St Paul and St John, and to the clear testimony of the primitive Church.

Hearken again. Another voice breaks the silence which ensues while we pause and say to ourselves, "Perhaps, after all, this may be the solution, when every other solution of our difficulties is found hopeless." And this voice, seeming to fall in with the idea last developed, proves at once how dangerous it is to meddle with the foundation of all true and living and lasting unity. The voice is the voice of all the latitudinarians and philosophers, who say, "Abolish all creeds (and what is that

but abolishing Christianity itself?) and the world will be at peace."

And have we no support on which to lean when men say that, except upon this condition or that unity is unattainable, either by absolute submission, or sinking of all points of difference, or abolishing the creeds? Oh yes, brethren, we say that "Salvation hath God appointed for walls and bulwarks;"—that in our Bible, and in our Prayer-book, and in the holy teaching of our Church, thousands, millions—millions that now rest in the Lord—have found the peace which they longed for. We say that loyalty to these is sufficient help for the soul; that these are a sufficient rule for the Church; that if we are disloyal to our own Church and its teaching, and, in one word, its law (for loyalty means obedience to the law), we cannot expect the support we need, either inwardly, or against the dangers that beset us from without; for who will trust those that have no law but their own will?

Brethren, on whatever points we may be divided, on this at least I hope we are perfectly at one—that unity can never be attained by every man following his own ways and ideas; that, until haply in the course of time, let me say in God's own good time, a wider union on the true basis of faith and order can be brought about, we who are met together are bound—the clergy by the formularies which they have subscribed with their hands, the laity by their allegiance to her, who is, in this land of their inheritance, a true and Apostolic branch of the Catholic Church: yes, are bound together in one as the Body of Christ and members in particular, even that body, to which their Lord's promise was given, "He will guide you into all truth." Yes, He will guide you. Be assured of that. The way is dark and slippery: even when a great door and effectual seems to be opening before us, there are many adversaries; many who hate the truth; many whose love and knowledge being but partial, are opposed to it in its fulness; many whom the god of this world hath blinded; many who are wise in their own conceits. But be sure that the heavenly hand will guide you on and on, till you shall both love, and know, and see with your eyes. There was one, an eager controversialist and disputer in his day, yet who sought the Lord and held fast by the promise—it was Richard Baxter—who said at the close of his life that he looked back with sorrow on everything he had done of a party kind,

and could only feel any comfort in thinking of what he had been able to do for peace and unity.

The great question to which I have referred, and others affecting the welfare of the Church more nearly and deeply, questions which concern the very foundations on which the Church is built, the whole validity of her dispensations, her power to bind and loose, her unity with other Churches, her relation to the civil Government, and yet her true spiritual independence, and whether recent legislation has or has not in the least affected that independence—all that is included, or can be included, under that saying, "Render unto Cæsar Cæsar's dues, but to God His own"—questions of this kind are necessarily excluded from our deliberations, lest perchance, through incautious words spoken or party excitement, any should be offended or made weak. Our concern is rather with the superstructure than with the foundation, with what concerns the individual man in his power of usefulness, in his self-restraint, in his daily relations to his fellow-men, in the discharge of the duties committed to him, both for his own welfare and for that of the body.

Because we believe implicitly that gifts were given for the full accomplishment of all that God would have to be done by His Church, that such power as we see put forth from time to time for the repression of some dreadful malady that has eaten into the very heart of the body is all of Him who has set in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, and after these, powers of various kinds, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues and the interpretation thereof, and hath bidden us to covet earnestly the best of these, and to use them unto edifying, each in its true proportion; and withal has shown unto us a more excellent way—the way of charity—without which none of these gifts were of any real avail to carry out His gracious purpose—because we believe these things, we are assembled together this day to help and encourage one another; to learn from one another; to hear what each in his own sphere of work, using his own gift, hath found to be most helpful to remedy the evil which sin hath spread so wide. Oh! baleful power of sin, felt in every heart, and from heart to heart like a contagious disease diffusing thyself, with thee we wage our warfare; hopeful, because it is written, "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him."

Brethren, there is an enemy that hath come in truly like an overwhelming flood—intemperance—the excessive use of strong drinks, enfeebling the bodies, perverting and corrupting the minds and hearts of men, destroying the happiness of home and hearth, turning the joy of marriage into a curse instead of a blessing, clouding all sense, dulling all affection, inciting to all sin, polluting and defiling the whole work of God. Many an honest labourer there is in this region who, using his well-earned wages for the support of himself and his children, according to God's ordinance, worships, and is kept by grace divine; but hundreds, alas! who tread these joys under their feet, slaves to strong drink. Shall we not stretch out a hand to help these? Will not the Spirit of God, by power of speech or wisdom of counsel given to some in this assembly, save some of these, so that from this day shall date renewed efforts on the part of employers of labour, on the part of pious fellow-workmen to save their fellows, on the part of our brethren the clergy and their helpers, to go forth again in the strength of the Lord God to pluck them out of the fire? May God bless the word spoken on this behalf!

Then, again, seeing that God hath ordained the relation of master and servant, and hath, for the welfare of His creatures and their trial in a state of probation, made both rich and poor, and assigned to each their relative duty; and seeing that if masters are froward and servants are grudging of their service, and the rich forgetful of the poor, and the poor uneasy and discontented, much evil must ensue, surely it behoves the Church of God, which hath received charge to teach His truth, to set forth plainly the duties of these classes into which God hath divided mankind? Surely from such an assembly as this should go forth a voice to dissuade from injustice on the one side, and what is not less injustice on the other; to check, if it may yet be checked, that ranging of class against class, which, in whatever country or state it be found, works ruin and misery. Manifestly it is in no spirit of dictation that we speak either to rich or poor. An assembly we are of grave and thoughtful men, whose hearts as we hope God hath touched, met together to discharge ourselves of the trust which we believe Him to have committed to us as members of His Body, the Church, whose rule is that the members should have the same care one for another; that if possible it should be said of us as it was said

of those that had the first-fruits of the Spirit: "Neither was there among them any that lacked." Not that we expect to attain unto such a state, or that our faith is such as that the mountain which divides us from it can be removed and cast into the sea—but that we acknowledge its blessedness and our great unworthiness, and do pledge ourselves to use such efforts as we can and may, to let it be seen that the Spirit of our Master hath not departed from among us.

Again, though this land of England be not as Zebulon and Napthali—that land of darkness beyond Jordan—yet is it much to be deplored, that we suffered the children of them that live by the work and labour of their hands, and of classes above them, to grow up in too great ignorance of what we were bound to teach them; and not until the evils of this ignorance were developed in the danger of entrusting power to those who knew not how to use it, did we arise and awake and set our hands to the work, which now all acknowledge to be necessary. And even now we have too much reason to be dissatisfied with the result of what we have attempted to do, and there are difficulties to be overcome which can only be surmounted by a careful consideration of what is due to the condition of parents, to the claims of their children for maintenance at their hands, to the State, and above all to the word which the Lord spake unto the Apostle, "Feed my lambs." This is the very opportunity for such deliberations, for considering all that affects the general welfare of the community, rich and poor, learned and ignorant alike.

But I should not be acting truly by those who have desired me to preach the Word of God this day, if I did not set in the first place for honour and importance in the discussions which shall presently open under God's blessing, that one matter—so difficult and delicate from its very nature, of which none will be more painfully conscious than those who have been asked to take part in it—I mean personal holiness, as influencing conduct in the family, in society, in trade, with all the helps that can be brought to bear on these duties. Why, brethren, if for this matter alone we had assembled in these numbers; if we had come together from our several abodes and occupations to consider this and this only:—"Wherein can I, in the relations in which I stand to those of my own house, to my friends and acquaintance, or to those with whom I am brought in contact

daily and hourly—or in my dealings, in buying and selling, and in all that cleaves to contract and exchange—wherein can I better conform myself to the Pattern, the bright Exemplar, my Saviour, my Jesus, my God, as He was when He tabernacled among men?" But the question goes deeper still. Observe it is "personal holiness" in respect of these things. Personal holiness—*i.e.*, as I am and demean myself, not in man's sight, but in the sight of the great Searcher of hearts. If this were the only matter we were met here to consider, and if we brought to bear on this and this only the experience of our lives; if they that speak and they that hear ponder this truly, and resolve in their heart of hearts to be guided by what the Spirit of God shall convince them of in the discussion, what a blessing should this Congress be, through your zeal who have spared neither strength, nor pains, nor sacrifice of your earthly substance to make it a blessing—I do not say a success, that word savours of what is most thought of in all our worldly assemblies, but I say to make it a blessing. What a blessing it would be to this whole neighbourhood, to many like neighbourhoods, to the Church in this nation, to many who, having gone to dwell in countries far from home, still look back with longing eyes to the land of their birth, of their baptism; to the land where they received, from lips that speak no more on earth, the first lessons of Christian faith, and hope, and love.

And may not by degrees the bond which binds the Churches together in one be strengthened, that neither distance, nor the necessary diversity of operations in various peoples, nations, and languages keep those asunder, whom one and the same Spirit informs and guides, that they who dwell in the uttermost parts of the earth may see our tokens, and so the outgoings of the morning and evening rejoice together? While I speak to you here another Bishop from the far West is addressing other members of this Conference in a neighbouring church. May his words and mine be acceptable words; but more than this, may they be upright, even words of truth,—may they be the words, which not the wisdom of man teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; to whose guidance, brethren, I commend you, in the firm and humble hope that our assembling together is sanctified by the presence of our Lord in our midst, and by the power of the Spirit, to the glory of God the Father.

If our desire be unto Him and the remembrance of His name; if we use the manifestation of the Spirit not for our own profit, nor to display our own special gift, whatever it may be, but for the profit of many that they may be saved; if we came together this day and shall depart from this holy Conference with the prayer in our hearts, and on our lips, that the distractions of the Church may be healed, then we need not doubt but that He will prosper us in this our undertaking. The light may shine more brightly in our cottage homes; the purifying and sanctifying influences of the Spirit may be felt in men's ordinary dealings one with another; the asperities of party spirit may be softened; remedies may be applied to the real grievances of the Church and of society, for that we on this great occasion, remembering the wholesome caution of the Apostle, "Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves," stood fast in one Spirit, and with one mind strove together for the faith of the Gospel.

THE SERMON

PREACHED IN ST MARK'S CHURCH, SHELTON,
STOKE-UPON-TRENT,

On Tuesday, October 5th, 1875,

BY THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

THE SERMON

BY THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

"For it seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things."—Acts xv. 28.

We may with fairness say that these words embody a *great* principle, because an *apostolic* one. It is one by means of which the primitive Church settled a serious difficulty that had arisen between two schools of thought in the Church. And the question which was solved by the application of this principle was not a trifling one. It was serious enough to engage the great Apostles St Paul and Barnabas in "discussion and disputation" with converts from the powerful sect of the Pharisees. It became *the* question of the day. It demanded for its solution a meeting of the first Christian council which decided the subject of controversy on the authority of the Holy Ghost. The council, moreover, perpetuated in a pastoral letter the principle on which their decision was founded—it was this—"For it seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things."

There are dissensions and disputations in the Church of England as well as formerly in the Church of Antioch, and he would be a daring controversialist who would deny that the principle which decided a great strife in the one Church, should not be applied for the same end in the other.

But while the authority of this principle will be admitted, we shrink from the application of it, though thoughtful men have ever seen the reasonableness of it, and have enshrined it in the maxim, "*In necessariis meritas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.*" Still it is a hard lesson that is taught us by the Holy Ghost and the

Apostles. May this Congress do something towards rallying the Church around this great standard principle, which more than anything else will help to solve burning questions, make the Church of England "rejoice for the consolation," and prove the only sure basis on which "the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her may be drawn more closely together." It is for these reasons that I invite your attention to this cardinal point; for though it is no easy task to select a subject, suitable to an inaugural service at a Congress of brethren representing every shade of opinion, and drawn together by the earnestness which like a fire burns within them till at last they speak with their tongue; yet I take it, that I cannot be mistaken if I dwell on the first subject for discussion as printed in the "Table of Meetings." It was not by accident that the first subject chosen is, Increased unity in the Church as a desirable object, and how it may be attained. Without detracting from the importance of the other topics to be discussed, let me say that the first in order is, beyond all comparison, the first in the solemnity of its importance. Other subjects that will occupy attention are comparatively of *local* interest, this is of *world-wide* interest. It does not deal with the Church *in* England alone, nor yet with the Church *of* England alone, but with the whole Anglican Communion throughout the world. The progress of events is making this great subject still greater. Let it not be supposed that I exaggerate the urgent necessity of giving it our thoughts and prayers, because my work for Christ and the Church has been for twenty-six years carried on in a colony and not in the mother country. The fact is, exaggeration is impossible. We do not (thank God) live in a day when the historian's sneer is deserved. The Church of England is not now "as local an institution as the Court of Common Pleas." On the contrary, we live in a day when the English Church is being planted widely and deep in foreign soils, when emigration and love of adventure, steam and telegraphs are at work to spread abroad the language and traditions of Britain. Any moment may introduce us to discoveries which may throw past inventions into the shade, and still further facilitate the spread of our religion. It is therefore the part of prudence to anticipate and provide for a possible future when the Church abroad shall outnumber the Church at home, and take counsel "how they may be drawn more closely together," *now* when the Mother Church not only outnumbers those in communion with her abroad, but sur-

passes them in theological learning and a more extensive experience; *now*, when the children abroad are willing to defer to that learning and experience of the Church at home. The time may come when, through a self-reliant spirit akin to pride, branches of the Anglican Communion may become in some instances dissociated from the Parent Church, or disintegrated themselves—but whether this shall happen or not, depends largely on the exercise of a wise foresight by the Church in the present day.

How the Church of England and those churches in communion with her, may be more closely drawn together is, however, but a branch of a much wider subject, the unity of the Church universal. Hence again its great importance. In order to the unity of the whole, we must have a beginning in the component parts. The various branches of the Church must become habituated to the idea of unity, its blessings and its privileges; and a yearning after this unity is an evident and a prevailing feature in every department of Christianity. However varied, and however hopeless, the schemes for producing unity may be, the prayer that it may be effected is almost universal. It was a solemn topic of discussion when, for the first time, the Bishops of the Anglican Communion met for counsel together at the Lambeth Conference. The three great sections of Canadian Presbyterianism have lately been united in one body, and a Pan-Presbyterian Conference has been engaged in the effort of drawing more closely together all the Presbyterian communities throughout the world. The depth of meaning in the Saviour's words, "That they may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me," is being more and more fathomed, so that the religious instinct of our times is ready to pronounce an anathema on the founders of a new sect. This is indeed an era of strivings after amalgamation on the part of religious organisations, of delegations conveying fraternal greetings from Christians of one continent to those of another. It was the earnestness of a desire for closer union and intercourse, that gave such heartiness to the welcome extended by the American Church to the Bishop of this diocese, representing, as he did, both the English and colonial churches.

Now it is our duty not only to ask, but also to answer the question, How is this craving after unity to be met and satisfied? How is this aspiration, springing from the conviction that if ever the world is to be brought to believe that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world, unity must prevail, how is this aspiration

to be met? First, I would say, not by attempts at legislation. Even if a competent legislature were possible, no sane man believes that its enactments would be desirable. If it be practically impossible to obtain absolute uniformity in the Church of England, how hopeless must be the attempt to achieve it throughout the Anglican Communion as regards either theological views, pious opinions, or ritual observances. The idea, therefore, of coercive legislation cannot be entertained. That must be left to the Anglican provincial synods and conventions abroad, and to the convocations of the English Church at home, so far as this is possible in an established Church.

Diocesan synods are now an accomplished fact abroad, and the only remaining want is their establishment at home. Regarding this want, it does not become me to say much. I am well aware that there exists a strong desire that the want should be supplied, and I am also aware of the difficulties that lie in the way of diocesan synods acquiring the power of legislation, touching matters however local or financial. That the difficulty will be overcome I make no doubt, and the sooner the better, not only for the sake of unity, but for the sake of preserving the establishment of the Church. In the security of a privileged because an established Church, there may seem to be no very urgent necessity for a system of graduated synods, but our ears and eyes are becoming accustomed to the word "Disestablishment." Now God forbid that the State should too deliberately divorce itself from the Church of England. I believe that under disestablishment the State would suffer greater loss than the Church, and therefore, from patriotic as well as ecclesiastical motives I would deprecate it, and labour to postpone it to the most distant day possible. And this may be done by the organisation of diocesan synods, which as we know becomes a necessity *after* Disestablishment; then why not in time test their efficiency in resisting Disestablishment? The Canadian and Irish churches have been disendowed and disestablished, and in each case we find as a result, the prevalence of a current belief, that had there existed a synodical organisation, so far as was compatible with an established Church, the union of Church and State might have been perpetuated.

In order, then, brethren, to draw the branches of the Anglican Communion more closely together, the first grand essential is that "no greater burden than necessary things" be laid upon the various

provinces of the Church in matters pertaining to pious opinions, discipline, and ceremonial. This apostolic principle will ensure to us all that we ought to demand, substantial unity with circumstantial variety. A Pan-Anglican synod, representing provinces thus constituted, meeting at stated intervals, not for legislation but for counsel, would maintain the visible unity of the Church; resolutions and pastoral letters from such a body on such great questions as the revision of our authorised version of the Holy Scriptures, or the creeds and articles of our communion, would then express such a consonance of the whole Church as would be irresistible, and a great step would be gained towards Catholic unity by the existence of a council which might speak with authority on such absorbing topics as that of our communion with the Eastern Church, and our duty towards the Old Catholic Reformation.

There is yet another way in which the unity of the branches of the Anglican Church may be effectually promoted, and that is by increased dedication of ourselves, our souls and bodies, to the glory of Christ and the progress of missionary work. No one can escape responsibility on this head. Every member of the Church in his vocation and ministry is bound to this duty; it is one of those "necessary things" the burden of which is laid upon him by the Holy Ghost and the Apostles. Let no one pretend to anxiety for the unity of the Church, who has not first proved his love for her extension abroad as well as at home. Want of unity is, as we know from our Lord's words as well as from daily experience, the great hindrance to missionary success. But though the work of missions be greatly impeded by the disunion of Christians, yet the work if carried on in faith may have an influence in the direction of unity. Nothing tends to impart breadth of vision and true liberality to the soul more than missionary labours. There will be great room for differences of opinion regarding the details of missionary operations, but the identity of aim to disciple and baptize all nations will unite in spirit all true missionaries. St Paul differed from St Barnabas in his choice of a companion in their missionary tour, but we are sure that their common love for their work brought them together again. Let all those who pray for unity, in order that the world may believe, show their sincerity by providing missionary preachers, for "how can they believe *without* a preacher?" And when they have been supplied, let not undue expectation of rapid and successful results lead us to unfair-

ness and disappointment. My brethren, the average success of missionaries abroad is quite equal to the average success of missionaries at home. But much more is often demanded not only in the way of success but of self-devotion: suffer a word of remonstrance regarding that carping criticism which sees much evil in the temporary absence of a missionary Bishop or priest from his allotted work, but which sees none whatever when the same thing occurs in the case of the home episcopate or priesthood.

Why should the public opinion of the Church deny to the foreign missionary what it yields generously to the home missionary, temporary relaxation? Why should missionaries who have returned home, either for a time or permanently, be regarded as deserters from duty? In the Apostolic Church it was otherwise: such missionaries as St Paul and St Barnabas used to return to head-quarters whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, and "rehearsed all that God had done with them." When missionaries, sent by the Church to do a certain work abroad, find from experience that they lack the health or aptitude for the work which are essential to success, then to return home and make way for others seems a duty. I know that in speaking of work performed at home or abroad by missionaries of the cross, we have little cause to think of it as deserving credit or applause; but if in the interests of the mission cause itself, I must speak as a man, I would ask whether the Church does not owe somewhat more to her ministers who have devoted even ten years of their ministerial life to her extension abroad, than to those who did not volunteer for service abroad at all. It would be a blessed thing, if multitudes of the clergy would but volunteer in rotation, for a few years of foreign service. When volunteers were invited, for the honour of the thing, to brave the vicissitudes of a voyage of discovery to the North Pole, the difficulty was to restrain the ardour which prompted so many to face the dangers which they well knew to be inevitable. But with the soldiers of the cross the case is different. We have to cry mightily unto God on days of special intercession, to incline the hearts of His servants to volunteer for His service in foreign parts. The difficulties of obtaining anything like an adequate staff of missionaries being admitted and deplored, I would ask, Is it fair, is it wise, to add yet another hindrance to missionary success, by leading intending volunteers to believe that (in the opinion of those who remain at home) duty

requires from them expatriation for life? Certainly, the prevalence of such a belief will not have a tendency to draw more closely together the Church of England and the churches in communion with her, but will establish another impediment in the way of catholic unity.

The great aim then of our rulers in Church and State should be, "to lay upon us no greater burden than necessary things;" and in matters of faith (if unity be our object) the required limit should not extend beyond the three creeds and the undisputed general councils. In matters of discipline and ceremonial, unity will be more effectually promoted by rubrics expressing the limits below which we must not sink, rather than those beyond which we must not rise; directions couched in language expressing what shall *suffice*, rather than what shall be rigidly exacted. And if, in addition, the Church in England would but rise to the grandeur of her missionary responsibilities, which are in direct proportion to the greatness of her opportunities, if she would not damp the ardour of her agents abroad or of intending volunteers at home, by placing them under vows for life, then with God's blessing we might anticipate a closer drawing together of all churches of our communion. But no degree of unity that we can hope for will prevent "dissensions and disputations" from arising in the Church. If she be true to her mission, she will be ever "tossed on the boisterous waves of a troublesome world," as unlike as possible to "a painted ship upon a painted ocean;" but a Church united on terms which I have ventured to submit, whose chief pastors should meet at intervals of ten years, under the presidency of the Archbishop, to whom the position of patriarch would be joyfully conceded, and with no flattering tones declare as the Apostles of old did, "what were, and what were not those necessary things," to be laid upon the conscience of the Church, then should be realised in all its blessings, "unity of spirit in the bond of peace." May the present Congress do its part towards this happy consummation, by the members thereof "forbearing one another in love," remembering "there is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS,

HELD IN STOKE-UPON-TRENT.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, 5th OCTOBER 1875.

THE RIGHT REVEREND the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD took his seat as PRESIDENT at 2·30 P.M., and spoke as follows:—

I HAVE first of all to read to you a letter from the President of the House of Deputies of the American Church:—

"*The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church.*
HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

NEW YORK, *October* 10, 1874.

"*To the Right Reverend,*
The Lord Bishop of Lichfield.

"The House of Deputies in the General Convention of 1874 have received with very great pleasure the invitation to attend the Church Congress to be held next year at Stoke, conveyed in the telegram to your Lordship, dated October 9. It is another gratifying evidence of that true oneness in CHRIST JESUS our LORD which has been so happily manifested in many ways between the venerable Mother Church and her daughter in America, and of which your Lordship's visits in 1871, and now in 1874, are among the most grateful instances.

"Doubtless many of the clergy and laity of this Church will gladly avail themselves of the opportunity of improvement and brotherly intercourse which will be furnished by the coming Congress. May I ask you to convey to the Bishop of Chichester the thanks of this House for his very kind invitation?

"By order, and on behalf of, the House of Deputies.

JAMES CRAIK, *President.*"

I have now the pleasure to introduce to this meeting the Bishop of Tennessee; also Dr Potter the Secretary of the House of Bishops, and some other American clergymen whom I am at present unable to name. I have also the pleasure of stating that we have representatives here from almost all the branches of our Church; the Archbishop of Armagh as the representative of the Irish Church; the Bishop of Edinburgh, and our old friend the Bishop of Argyll, as the representatives of the Scotch Church; we have the Bishops of Ontario and of Melbourne, as representatives of the Colonial Church, and I think also the Bishop of Nassau is here, though I have not seen him yet, and if I omit any names I hope I shall be forgiven; so that I think I may say all the branches of our Anglican Church are represented in this Congress.

It now becomes my duty to address to you a few preliminary remarks, but before I do that I am glad to inform you that much of what I may say as to the details of the forthcoming discussions has been said, in a manner highly appreciated by those who heard it, by the Bishop of Rochester in his sermon; and my comfort is, that whatever may seem defective in what I say as to the details of our discussions, has been more than amply supplied by my right reverend brother.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Now that the Church Congress has established its position, by fourteen years of success, it becomes every year more and more important to define its object and to trace out its path. An annual meeting, held for discussion alone, would speedily have fallen to the ground, if it had not been followed by results of great value. It has been felt that a gradual but certain progress has been made towards an end, the attainment of which is our heart's desire and prayer. That object is truth, not partial truth, but truth as perfect as God, by the teaching and guidance of the Holy Ghost, may be pleased to reveal.

The title of Church Congress defines our limits. We seek for truth within the limits of the Church. We recognise one definite standard of faith, by which alone we can hope to render to God any acceptable service. We meet to seek for an increase of faith, that we may be more abundant in good works.

Our search after truth has a distinct character of its own. We do not accept as infallible the authority of any mortal man, nor do we submit doubtful questions to the decision of a council; nor, again, do we agree to differ, as if truth were beyond our reach; but we invite a free expression of opinion from men of various habits of thought, in the hope that it will be found that the greater part of our differences will vanish, when we come to understand one another. The language of extreme party spirit is an unknown tongue to all but the initiated. The man of one party is a "barbarian" to the man of the other (1 Cor. xiv. 11). The value, therefore, of these Congresses will depend upon the degree in which all temperate expressions of opinion are patiently heard and carefully weighed. If any speaker should seem to transgress the unwritten law of propriety, which is assumed to be the rule of our meeting, it must be left to the President, in the absence of all standing orders, to restrain him within due limits.

The object, then, which we propose to ourselves, is the calm and earnest search after truth, with none of that excitement which would be inevitable if a synodical declaration were proposed to be carried by a majority of

votes. We need have no parties drawn up in battle array each in support of its own "views." We meet to hear opinions, which many will think at first to be very different from their own, and to ponder them in our hearts.

The rejection of an infallible authority upon earth obliges every one of us to confess that whereinsoever he differs from his fellow-Christians he may possibly be wrong. The Bible was given to unite us in one faith; but it is from the various interpretations of the Word of God that our divisions spring. Perfect confidence can come only from perfect agreement. Every other society of learned men, astronomers, physicians, geologists, engineers, is striving to elevate its own department of knowledge to the dignity of an exact science. How wonderful, then, is the despairing tone in which some mourn over our unhappy divisions, as if they were, what some allege of war, a necessary evil, which will never come to an end. Still more wonderful is it that some should find a sorry comfort in the thought that, after all, Christ is preached "yea, even of strife and contention" (Phil. i. 15). Most wonderful of all that some should leave our Church because of its divisions; as if the promise were revoked that "the Spirit of Truth will guide us into all truth" (John xvi. 13). Why should we despair of so attaining to the mind of Christ, that "we may all speak the same thing, and that we may be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. i. 10).

Some may say, "Are not these thoughts for the synod rather than the Congress? Are not the objects of the Congress purely practical, to inquire how Christian work may best be done?" I cannot put asunder what God has joined together. Christianity knows nothing of practice as distinct from doctrine. Every subject brought before the Congress presupposes faith as its groundwork—definite, distinct, dogmatic faith. Good works are the fruits of faith (Article XII). Our motive, our guide, our rule is faith.

If, then, we aim at increase of work, we must also aim at unity of faith. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" (Amos iii. 3.) Is not a large portion of our force neutralised by antagonism? Is it not a deplorable thing that earnest, faithful, pious men cannot work together, because they differ in religious opinion? Rival societies, rival journals, rival meetings, public and private—all these, like all opposing forces, counteract one another.

In the midst of this conflict of parties, can we suppose that this Congress has nothing to do with doctrine, because it does not claim the authority of a synod? Its highest object is to demonstrate visibly to the world, that, even in spite of our divisions, we are learning to keep the bond of peace while we are seeking for the unity of the Spirit. The icy

barriers which separated us are melting away as we draw near in Christian brotherhood to the *one* source of light and life.

Is there one in this great meeting who will not thankfully acknowledge the benefits which hundreds and thousands have received at former Congresses from the papers and addresses on the spiritual life? Can any subject be nearer to doctrine than this? What is spiritual life, but truth of doctrine received into the heart by faith, and acting upon the life of the believer? The soul of the Christian is nourished, not by diversity, not by controversy, not by speculation, but by unity of faith. It is as certain that the truth by which the soul lives is one truth, as that the air which we all breathe is one air. How thankful then ought we to be, when we look at the lists of the readers and speakers on the spiritual life, to see the names of men reputed to belong to every section of the Church, yet all meeting on the same platform in brotherly love; all setting forth the same one fundamental truth; with the same end in view of touching the hearts of their hearers, and deepening the spiritual life within them.

Is it not morally certain that those holy men of God are drawing nearer one to another? Who is it that gives them power to utter those heart-searching and soul-inspiriting words? It is not they that speak, but the Spirit of the Father that speaketh in them. And will not that Spirit guide them into all truth? not narrow, partial, self-complacent truth; but truth as it came forth from God; truth as it is in Jesus; truth as confessed by the Church, when "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul" (Acts iv. 32).

I have spoken of the spiritual influence of the Congress upon the heart. I must now speak of its effect in promoting Church organisation. The success of the early meetings of Congress gave an impulse to the spread of synodical action among the English dioceses. Synods of the colonial Churches in Canada and New Zealand had been held two years before the first meeting of the Congress. The synodical action of the Church in the United States began almost from the time of its foundation. But all these branches of the great Anglican Communion have yet to learn by what wise and comprehensive system they may be united together upon the basis of one standard of necessary truth, while each retains its own freedom of self-government. A meeting like this has many advantages in prosecuting such an inquiry. It opens its doors to Churchmen from all countries. Special invitations have been sent to every member of the Synod of the Province of Canada, and of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States. I fear that the late season of the year has prevented many of our Transatlantic brethren from accepting the invitation. But some are present who will feel a deep interest in our first subject:—

"The Church of England and the Churches in communion with her—How they may be drawn more closely together."

This is a subject which the Congress may well discuss in skirmishing order, before the whole array of the Lambeth Conference is brought to bear upon it. You have the advantage already spoken of, that the debate will not be marred by fretful anxiety about the result of a division. The object is clear: the promise is certain: it is no visionary mark towards which we press. It is that for which we so often pray, "that it will please God to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord" (*Prayer for Church Militant*).

A great step in this direction has been made by the Conferences at Cologne in 1872, and at Bonn in 1874 and 1875. This Conference was not a synod claiming authority for its decisions, but a voluntary meeting of men of various nations under the guidance of one of the wisest and most learned of theologians. I know that there are some who scoff at these meetings and disparage the results. Scoff as they may, the declarations of the Bonn Conference in 1874 obtained an almost unanimous assent from members of various Churches, and from men representing every school of religious thought among us. In these declarations a basis was laid upon which we may hope the unity of Scriptural and primitive doctrine may be built up. True, it was a voluntary meeting, but it had in it the mind of Him "who spake as one having authority" (Matt. vii. 29).

The Congress at its last meeting devoted a morning to the "Old Catholic movement." I do not see on our paper any mention of the Bonn Conference of 1875. But I must not omit to speak of it. The striking feature was the presence of so large a representation of the Eastern Churches. Surely the dawn is brightening in the East. It is too early to offer an opinion upon the results of that meeting. But they are full of promise. Between us and the Church of Rome there rises up an impassable barrier—the fourteen clauses added to the Creed by Pope Pius IV., and embodied in the canons of the Council of Trent; the dogma of the Immaculate Conception; and of Papal Infallibility. From the Eastern Churches we are divided only by three words added to the same Creed by the Council of Toledo. Is this a hopeless bar to reunion? Is one word of the Gospel of St John, and that an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, a cause sufficient to set aside the Saviour's prayer, that all may be one? It may be true, that if a formal council were to meet now, it would be unable to settle the question between East and West. But these genial Congresses, these international conferences, are softening the asperities of controversy, and preparing the way for a true synod of confederate Churches, each retaining its own freedom, but all united in the same confession of faith. This

was the primitive type of the Christian Church, and to this a large portion at least of Christendom by God's blessing may return.

We have on our paper this year a subject which I think is new. Its title is, "Recent Explorations and Discoveries in Bible Lands." These words remind us of the joint inheritance which the Christian and the Jew still possess in the Holy Land. I rejoice to see this subject introduced even in this restricted form. We cannot speak of Bible lands without thinking of them to whom the promised land was given. "Hath God cast away His people? God forbid" (Rom. xi. 1). "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so all Israel shall be saved" (*Ib.* v. 25). Our subject is not one of mere antiquarian research. It looks back a few thousand years, but it looks forward to eternity. It is not enough to trace the footsteps of him to whom the law was given on Mount Sinai, or of Him by whom grace and truth came. Mount Sinai and Mount Sion, Bethlehem and Calvary, Tabor and Gethsemane, all these are monuments of earth and stone on which are written the promises of a God who cannot change. To see these promises afar off, to be persuaded of them, and to embrace them, is as much a duty now as it was when Abraham went out, at God's command, not knowing whither he went. That city where ten sieges have fulfilled the prophecy, that not one stone should be left upon another, points to the New Jerusalem above, which is the Mother of us all. Even if we should hold our peace, her very stones would cry out and prophesy that "there shall come out of Sion the deliverer, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob" (Rom. xi. 26).

Why is the conversion of the Jews so slow? The answer is not of man, but of God. Of this we are sure, that "the Lord is not slack concerning His promise" (2 Peter iii. 9). But surely there are stumbling-blocks—hindrances which this Congress may help to remove. What is the lesson now taught to the Jews in those sacred places hallowed by the records of the Saviour in whom all Christians alike profess to believe? While a Turkish guard is needed to restrain the strife of Christians at the birth-place of their Lord, will the Jew, with his Isaiah in his hand, believe that we are the worshippers of the Prince of Peace? But we need not go to Palestine for examples. Let us look at home. What beauty is there in Christianity, as distorted in our so-called religious journals, that a Jew should desire it? We need the evidence so powerful in days of old, both with Jew and Gentile—"Behold how these Christians love one another."

Whatever may be said or done elsewhere, may the Church Congress, by its peace and charity and patient search after truth, set forth before all men a living evidence of the Gospel of Peace.

Now, as to that other proof which is required for the conversion of the Jews, that the fulness of the Gentiles should come in, is not our backwardness in the cause of Missions a negative stumbling-block both to Jew and Gentile? This is a subject to which this Congress has never been indifferent. We must return to it again and again. It stands on our paper under the head of Missions and Missionary Bishoprics. We have an ample scope. Our field is the world. We do not meet to congratulate one another upon the conversion of a few thousands here and there; but to ask ourselves the question, Why are there so many hundreds of millions still unconverted? Must we not fear that it is mainly owing to the inadequacy of our contributions, to the littleness of our faith, to our backwardness in prayer, to our keeping back our best men, to our too great readiness to give way to difficulties? Thus it is that the evidence fails. We have received a commandment which is feebly obeyed, and a promise which is coldly claimed; and therefore the Gentile world is in no haste to receive the Gospel which we preach, nor to believe that the true God is indeed with us.

I must briefly speak of the other subjects which bear upon the same central work of restoring unity to a divided Church. Revival movements; the employment of special preachers; religious and devotional books; woman's work; Church work in the army and navy, among the boatmen in our canals, and the seamen in our ports, among the blind and deaf and dumb; destitute children; pastoral work of every kind; religious education; lay agency; the supply of clergy—all these are the signs of a Church which knows and feels that God would have all men to be saved, and which is taught by the Holy Ghost to understand the spirit of her Master's thanksgiving—"Of them which Thou gavest Me I have lost none" (John xviii. 9).

To what end do all these signs point? Is it too much to say that this Congress, and those that have gone before, have traced out the path by which we may press on in simple faith and singleness of eye towards the attainment of all that God has promised—all for which the Lord died and rose again—all for which the Holy Ghost came down from heaven? I cannot doubt that the Anglican Church is the true centre round which may be rallied in God's own time all the scattered forces of those who agree in accepting Holy Scripture as their standard of faith, and the Creeds of the undivided Church as their summary of doctrine; stretching out her arms to the great English-speaking race now widely scattered round the earth—welcoming to her communion the Old Catholic, the Greek, the Russian, the Lutheran, the Scandinavian the Wesleyan—bearing with any errors she may discern in other branches of the Church, as she hopes her own may be forgiven—agreeing with them in well-de-

fined statements of necessary and fundamental truth—commending herself to Jew and Gentile by her visible unity —she may press on to the development of a catholicity as wide and as complete as is possible to be attained, until Rome, awaking from her dream of universal empire, shall be content to be, what she was at Nice and at Ephesus, one among many living stones, built up into one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCHES IN COMMUNION WITH HER: HOW THEY MAY BE DRAWN MORE CLOSELY TOGETHER.

PAPER.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Edinburgh.

It is impossible not to feel that the question of the more intimate union of the Church of England and the churches in communion with her is one of such gravity, involving such important issues, that no small responsibility lies on any one who undertakes to discuss it. It is obvious that any method suggested ought to be applicable to the whole Anglican Communion, and therefore to dwell on relations of the Church of England with any particular Churches might only lead us away from the general principles on which the question must be solved. Again, it is a widely different question from that which is sometimes substituted for it, how certain Churches may be kept from diverging from the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. Those indeed who love the Church of England most truly will feel that, though she has much to give, she has not a little to receive; that if she has much to teach, she has also much to learn. But, besides this, the union of Churches to be real must be, not dead coherence, but the living organic union of living bodies, acting and reacting reciprocally one upon another. To be the source of strength it must be spiritual fellowship, which means quickened vitality and enlarged apprehension of the manifold truth of God. The end proposed is really nothing else than the fulfilment, in part, of the Redeemer's prayer, that those that believe in Him should be one. And, therefore, if we would arrive at any substantial and permanent basis of union for the Churches of (what is known as) the Anglican Communion, it would be a serious mistake to look to some idiosyncrasies of the Church of England, or to any of those things which every particular Church has "authority to ordain, change, and abolish,"* as an expedient for drawing them together more closely, for we might be promoting a partial and temporary unity to the injury of that which is truly Catholic. But surely if our Blessed Lord and His Apostles have taught us—and they certainly have taught us—how those that believe on Him should be one, and how unity should be promoted and manifested, it will be our wisdom simply to adhere to these principles, and follow as closely as

* Art. XXXIV.—"Of the Traditions of the Church."

possible the method they indicate. I trust, therefore, that the vast importance of the question, and the danger of drifting away into unprofitable theories, will be my excuse, even if, in calling attention to the teaching of Holy Scripture on the subject, I seem to be repeating truths with which Churchmen must be supposed to be familiar.

The unity which our Lord desires of those that believe in Him is, you will remember, twofold. He prayed that they might be one, as the Father and the Son are one—that is, in the unity of one Spirit; and yet so that the world, which cannot discern that which is spiritual and invisible, might be convinced of His divine mission by their unity—that is, that they might be visibly and manifestly one. The unity therefore consists, as is fully expounded in Apostolic writings, in "one body," with its confession of the one faith, its visible seals of fellowship, and its subordination of offices; and, on the other hand, in the members of that one body keeping "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." And for this there is required not only a spirit of mutual forbearance, humility, and charity, but also that cultivated and matured knowledge which will preserve us from that which is the prolific source of divisions, from supposing one aspect or fragment of the truth to be the whole wisdom of God. And for the building up of the body of Christ * unto this "unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God," the offices of the ministry are instituted and endowed with spiritual gifts. But, further, the teaching of the New Testament is very definite and explicit as to the special method not only for maintaining, but also for manifesting, unity. Our Divine Master Himself has given † express directions as to the process through which dissensions should be ended; and although He takes, as His manner was, a dispute between two persons as a typical instance to illustrate general principles, yet these principles, as the context implies, are applicable to all occasions of offence. He teaches that when all has been done, through personal intercourse, that charity and equity demand, the case must then be referred to the Church—to the Christian society as a body corporate—and the disputant who shall refuse to accept the decision of the Church on the question at issue can no longer be treated as a brother. He confirms this (you will remember), and indicates that it is applicable to all questions that touch the welfare of His Church, by a solemn assurance of the validity of Church action, and by expounding the true and original causes of its force—namely, the power of united prayer and the presence of the Divine Head of the Church in its assemblies. The conditions and the limitations of Church action might be inferred from our Lord's own language. But there is one conspicuous instance in Apostolic times of the application of these principles, which supplies sufficient guidance for all ages. When the "burning question" of the relation of the Gentile converts to the law of Moses threatened to divide the Church, how was unity maintained? Why was it not sufficient for St Paul, in the full power of the Spirit of truth, to assert that Christian liberty which he has expounded in his writings? Because to preserve unity more is required than mere teaching. One aspect of truth indeed, though a Paul expound it, is not sufficient for that catholicity of truth without which Catholic unity cannot be sustained. There must be open conference, there must

* Ephes. iv. 12–16. † St. Matthew xviii. 15–20.

be united counsels, the arguments of the Judaizers must be fully heard, and, finally, there must be concurrence in harmonious action. And the result is, that while the truth which St Paul teaches is more distinctly affirmed than before, yet practical rules are determined by common consent, in order that causes of offence may not arise, and that the unity of the Church, notwithstanding some external diversities, may be not only maintained, but also manifested. These canons of discipline of the first and typal synod of the Christian Church were undoubtedly binding, in accordance with our Lord's teaching, for the purpose of preserving unity; * yet that they were not regarded as universal laws, or infallible dogmas, is evident from St Paul's subsequent instructions on the same subject to the Corinthians.† But this general conclusion is obviously to be drawn—that whatever difficult and exciting questions may disturb or threaten the peace of the Church, the method ordained for preventing and healing breaches of unity is through decisions of the Church, following mutual conference, free discussion, patient and tolerant consideration of the arguments of all concerned. And such judgments, being determined by general consent, through the Spirit of Christ enabling those who seek His guidance to discern the common truth in which their differences are harmonised, have the authority of the Divine Head of the Church for the purpose contemplated in them—that is, the maintenance and the manifestation of unity. Some of us have learnt by happy experience how greatly God blesses Church action when thus used; how noisy disputes are hushed and shamed into silence, and the way is made clear as the day, when common counsels have terminated in harmonious action. And of the power of mutual conference, when directed by the spirit of wisdom, patience, and charity, to discover the path of unity even when it seemed hopelessly lost for ages, the late conference at Bonn has supplied an instance, from which all who seek the peace of Jerusalem may well take courage. At all events, if the method for cherishing and preserving unity, which our Lord and His Apostles have taught us, should fail of success through the want of a right spirit in those who adopt it, it is vain to try any other. Whenever other methods have been used, whether in past ages or modern times, by Bishops of Rome or by English Sovereigns and Parliaments—methods in which the spirit of law has been substituted for that of the gospel, and the bare authority of office, or perhaps of secular power, for the authority of the Spirit of love and truth—a constrained and unreal uniformity may have been produced for a time, but the divisions created have been far more serious than any which seemed to be healed.

To apply these general principles to the question before us, it is only necessary to observe that the same reasons as determine that differences among Christians should be concluded through the action of the Church of which they are members, also indicate that the union of different Churches should be maintained through the Church action of the larger corporate society which includes them all. Particular Churches are sometimes apt, like single individuals, to be one-sided and narrow-minded, and their decisions need to be corrected and harmonised by those of the whole body of which they form a part. That is, in ecclesiastical language, the synod of a diocese should be subordinate to that of the province; the synod of the

* Acts xvi. 4. † 1 Cor. x. 23-30.

province to that of all the Churches with which it is in communion. And this—which is nothing more than the expression of the Scriptural principle in the only form in which it can be practically applied—is the very conclusion embodied in a resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1867 on the same question as is now before us. It was resolved —"That in the opinion of this conference unity in faith and discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican communion by the due and canonical subordination of the synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a synod or synods above them."

The serious evils that have arisen from long neglect of the legitimate method for maintaining unity are unhappily but too apparent in the Church of England at the present hour. And to this neglect are also due the chief impediments to the general adoption of this method in the Churches of the Anglican communion, as is illustrated by the history of the colonial Churches. At first, as the Church extended herself to the colonies of the British empire, it was imagined that each new diocese was an integral part of the Church of England, and that the Bishops, clergy, and laity were simply members of that Church, subject to its laws in all Church matters. But, as these laws are those of an Established Church, intimately connected with the complicated system of English Law of which they form a part, and with no legal force except on English soil, it is impossible to determine the meaning, in law, of a Church of England out of England; and certainly Holy Scripture does not help us to understand that which is inconsistent with all its representations of the Church. This erroneous notion, however, was confirmed by the letters patent under which the Bishops were appointed, and, perhaps, in the absence of anything else, it has been well that the sense of unity should be cherished even by this fictitious and merely imaginary bond of union. Yet the evil consequences have far exceeded the advantages, whatever they may have been. And of these evils, the greatest has been that organisation through Church synods was not from the first recognised as an inherent necessity for the Church wherever it extends itself. Many, who considered themselves attached members of the Church of England, looked on synods as a useless and dangerous innovation, indeed as an act of separation from that Church, though only by them can union be maintained. And although this feeling is at last giving way to the necessities of the case, yet it is too evident that the great obstacle to a real and more intimate union of the Churches arises from the fact that so many English Churchmen, instead of deriving from Holy Scripture their ideas of the responsibilities, functions, and rights of Churches of Christ, have little or no conception of any such duties or powers outside an Act of Parliament. It is, indeed, a conviction which has been forced upon me, through long and varied and very painful experience, that the first thing necessary to the closer union of the Churches of the Anglican communion is, that we should recover the true idea of the reality, the value, and the authority of Church action, as ordained by Christ for this express purpose, that those who believe in Him may be manifestly one, and that so the world may believe that He was sent of God.

I am aware that some, who feel strongly the necessity of synodical action, consider that it would be expedient in our colonies that it should

receive the authority of law from the local legislatures. If legislation is required to give powers for the tenure of property or to remove disabilities, by all means let such as is expedient be obtained, when it is possible to obtain it. But so far as the question of Church unity is concerned, the authorisation by law of the synodical system is, I am persuaded, much more of a hindrance than a help. First of all, it hampers the freedom of Church action, making the system rigid and incapable of modification except at the will of a legislature, perhaps hostile or jealous, almost certainly indifferent. I could give several instances of this if time permitted me. Secondly, it interferes with the homogeneousness of the synodical system, increasing the difficulty of the "due and canonical subordination of synods." And thirdly, it tends to alter the character of synods. Instead of their being Church assemblies, the object of which is to promote the unity of the Spirit, by bringing Christian brethren through mutual conference and mutual concessions to accept some decision by common consent, the danger is greatly increased—and that the danger exists no one who has had much experience of synods will, I think, deny—of their becoming mere ecclesiastical parliaments, in which the object is to carry a resolution in spite of opposition by a majority of votes. No doubt binding rules are necessary, for there are everywhere self-willed men who will set at nought the judgment of their brethren; but the position of the Church, both in the United States and in Scotland, proves that such rules may be made without obtaining legal authority for the synodical organisation. And, believing as I do, that the moral and spiritual force of synodical action is the one thing of value for the preservation of unity, I should much deprecate that which would be likely to make synods mere instruments for the exercise of legal powers, and for framing hard and fast rules with coercive authority.

No doubt the method to which the Lambeth Resolution points requires, in order to complete the scheme, a general synod of the Churches of the Anglican communion. And (I would ask) what difficulties are there in the way of this that Christian wisdom and courage may not overcome? —that is, if we are in earnest in seeking the unity of Christ's Church. If only those principles and purposes of Church synods are kept in view, which Holy Scripture teaches, and which I have, very feebly and imperfectly, endeavoured to expound, we should find (I expect) that it is almost as easy and simple a matter to hold a General Synod from time to time for special purposes as to meet in a Church Congress every year. True, its decisions would possess no coercive power, no greater force, in short, than those of the Council at Jerusalem; perhaps we hardly require more. If it were really a representative assembly; if, from all parts of the British empire and from the United States, there were gathered together, in the name of our one Lord, such men as the Anglican communion does produce —men of approved wisdom, learning, experience, and piety; men also fairly representing the various schools of religious thought in the Church (including, as at Jerusalem, even those who seem the most contentious); and if, through the Spirit of Him Who is present in the assemblies of His Church, fundamental truths were recognised, and laws for the maintenance and manifestation of unity were accepted by general consent, surely this would be a proof to the world that we are one in Christ, such as never has been witnessed since the primitive times of Christianity. But such an assembly

must meet, not in the spirit of fear, but in the spirit of power and of love, and in the full assurance that it is authorised by the Divine Redeemer to act in His behalf. Let it repudiate, clearly and unmistakably, all legal or coercive powers, and all such claims as Rome asserts; but let it speak in no faltering accents, in the name of Christ, of those things that belong to peace and the edification of the Church. And even though, for our sins, and especially those of our unhappy divisions, such a method fail at first to produce all the results desired, let us not be impatient. It is surely far better to work and wait on, humbly and patiently, in the way marked out by Christ and His Apostles, than to take refuge in temporary expedients which may promise much, but can, in the end, only aggravate the evils they attempt to remedy.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Melbourne.

Of the desirableness of the object contemplated in the thesis upon which I have been requested to address you, there can be but one opinion in this assembly. We all, I doubt not, very earnestly desire that the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her may be more closely drawn together. To consult upon means for effecting this was, I believe, the chief purpose for which the Conference at Lambeth in 1867 was convened, and several important resolutions relating to it were then adopted. One of these was, "That in the opinion of this Conference unity in faith and discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican communion by due and canonical subordination of the synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a synod or synods above them." Another was, "That a committee of nine members (with power to add to their number, and to obtain the assistance of men learned in ecclesiastical and common law) be appointed to inquire into and report upon the subject of the relations and functions of such synods, and that such report be forwarded to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury with a request that, if possible, it may be communicated to an adjourned meeting of this Conference." A third was, "That the committee (appointed by the last-quoted resolution), with the addition of the names of the Bishops of London, St David's, and Oxford, and all the colonial Bishops, be instructed to consider the constitution of a voluntary spiritual tribunal, to which questions of doctrine may be carried by appeal from the tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each province of the colonial Church, with like directions for the forwarding of the report to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the communication of it to an adjourned meeting of the Conference."

I shall hereafter refer to the reports of these two committees; but I would previously direct your attention to what really constitutes the data of the problem proposed for our solution; viz., the existing ecclesiastical status of the several Churches which are in communion with the Church of England, their relation to her and to one another, and their other distinctive characteristics. These particulars require to be carefully investigated, and the several questions arising out of them duly considered, before we attempt to determine how the object we have in view can be successfully accomplished.

In the first place, then, I would observe that the Churches in communion with the Church of England (by which description I understand to be

intended all such as were represented at the last, or would be represented at any future General Conference at Lambeth) include two distinct classes: the one consisting of the Churches in the colonies and dependencies of the British empire, and the various missionary Churches founded by the Church of England; the other, of the Church of Ireland and the Episcopal Churches in Scotland and America. These two classes it is necessary to consider separately. For the Churches in the latter class, while connected with the Church of England by the profession of a common faith, the recognition of a common ministry, and the use of what, notwithstanding some existing and other contemplated variations, is substantially a common liturgy—connected with her also by a common language, and as to the American Church by a common ancestry, as to the Irish and Scotch Churches by a common nationality—owe her no allegiance, but are perfectly independent. They are governed by their own synods or conventions; they form their own codes of ecclesiastical law; and they appoint their own ecclesiastical tribunals. They are, therefore, simply *Sister Churches.* Their relation to the Church of England is one of perfect equality, and in considering how she and they may be more closely drawn together, we are embarrassed by no legal difficulties.

With respect to the Churches in the former class it is very different. What is their status, and what the relation in which they stand to their mother Church, are questions upon which at present the most positive opinions, in direct opposition to one another, are maintained both in England and in the colonies; and from which, if they be not soon amicably settled, the most painful conflicts and schisms are likely to arise. It is with these Churches that I am specially concerned, and I shall endeavour to set before you, as clearly as my prescribed time will allow, the circumstances respecting them, which seem to me chiefly to demand consideration. My observations will be confined to what may be strictly designated colonial Churches—viz., the Churches in Canada, the West Indies, South Africa, Australasia, and New Zealand. The Church in India, which has its own peculiar constitution, and some missionary Churches do not need to be remarked upon.

The first circumstance to be noted concerning these colonial Churches is, that all of them have, I believe, their diocesan, and some also their provincial synods or assemblies, which consist of Bishops and other clergymen with a number of select laymen, and of which the rules, either by force of Acts of the local legislatures or by virtue of voluntary agreements, are binding, as to matters within their jurisdiction, upon all, whether clerical or lay, officers of the Church. I say *as to matters within their jurisdiction*, because such synods or assemblies as have been constituted by local legislatures are plainly restricted by the limitations which those legislatures have imposed upon them; and such as have been formed by mutual agreements, even if such agreements contain no express limitations, are, according to high legal authority, restricted by the relation in which the Churches represented by them stand to the Church of England.

A second and very important circumstance is, that these Churches have in general assumed for their designation the title either of *The United Church of England and Ireland*, or, *The Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland*, or, *The Church of England, in* Canada, New Zealand, or whatever the locality may be;—thereby declaring not merely

their close affinity, but also their actual identity, with either the formerly United Church of England and Ireland or the existing Church of England. Hence their members, according to the judgment of the late Master of the Rolls in "Bishop of Natal *versus* Gladstone and others," are bound by all the laws of that Church to which they profess to belong.

But, and this is the third circumstance to be adverted to, some years ago a provincial synod, convened by the late Bishop of Capetown (and its example has been recently followed by the General Synod of New Zealand), adopted a different designation—viz., "The Church in the Province of South Africa"—and consistently therewith claimed for that Church "the ecclesiastical status, rights, powers, and relations of (what it called) a province of the Anglican communion." Here, then, has arisen a question of fundamental importance. Can this claim be legally sustained? If it can, then any colonial Church may assert for itself the same independence as is possessed by the Church of Ireland, and the Episcopal Churches in the United States of America and in Scotland. The question, you will observe, is not whether a number of private persons may agree to adopt a certain ecclesiastical constitution, and bind themselves by the rules of a certain deed of association, and call themselves by a certain name. About this there can be no dispute. But it is whether a particular individual, who has declared his persuasion that he was called to the office of Bishop, according to the order of the realm of England, and who has been consecrated according to the forms of the Church of England, and appointed by the Queen's letters-patent to a colonial see, can afterwards, in his office as Bishop of such see, by a voluntary compact with other Bishops and the clergy of his own and other dioceses, and with certain laymen, form and put himself at the head of an independent Church, retaining at the same time his income, and all the rights appertaining to the position to which he was consecrated. The importance of the question will appear if we reflect upon the actual present consequence, and the possible, and not improbable, future consequences of this assumption of an independent status. The actual present consequence is, that there are now in the colony of Natal two rival bishops: one who, although he has been adjudged by the Church in South Africa to be deposed, is still recognised by the law of England as the rightful Bishop; the other, who has been placed there by the South African Church, and is not recognised by the law of England. In our endeavour to bring the Churches of our communion more closely together, our first object should surely be to prevent the recurrence of such a scandalous schism.

Again, it is possible, and, as it appears to me, not altogether improbable, that at some future time the person whom the Church in the Province of South Africa recognises as Bishop of Capetown, may not be, according to the law of England, the rightful occupant of that see, and therefore not entitled to the income provided for such Bishop by the munificence of the Baroness Burdett Coutts. Of the right to his position of the present Bishop no doubt can be entertained, since he has been consecrated under the licence of the Queen by the Archbishop of Canterbury; but it is not unlikely that the title of any one whom the Bishops of the Church in the Province of South Africa may hereafter consecrate will be disputed. That this apprehension is not unreasonable is shown by the intelligence received a few weeks since of an association having been formed at

Capetown, called "The Church of England Defence Association," which threatens to contest the right of the late Bishop to transfer property held by him for the Church of England in his diocese, to other persons to hold in trust for the Church in the Province of South Africa. There is, therefore, a probability of painful and costly lawsuits ensuing, and a schism being thereby occasioned, unless some means be adopted by the Church at home for at once settling the question at issue.

Again, to return to the Churches whose titles indicate an identity with the Church of England. A further circumstance to be noted respecting them is, that if, according to the judgment of the late Master of the Rolls, they are bound by all the laws of the mother Church, they are not only incapable of making any alteration in the Book of Common Prayer themselves, but must adopt all such as may at any time be made in it by the Imperial Parliament, and also accept the interpretation put upon it by the ecclesiastical courts in England on all matters of doctrine and discipline. This, however, is not the view which some of them take of their own position; for at its last session the General Synod of the Church in New Zealand adopted a series of resolutions for modifying the service for the consecration of Bishops, and the 20th and 37th of the Thirty-nine Articles, and for altering the title of the Church from "The Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand," to "The Church of the Province of New Zealand, commonly called the Church of England." If these changes have been legally made, it follows that the synod of any colonial Church, not restricted by special legislative enactment, may modify the services and Articles at its own discretion.

Moreover, if questions of doctrine and ritual are decided by local ecclesiastical tribunals, such as many colonial Churches are now legally authorised to constitute, the decisions upon them, even where there is a sincere desire to conform to the law of the mother Church, will almost certainly from time to time vary considerably, and hence the Churches will gradually drift away in various directions, both from her and from one another.

Such are some of the circumstances in the present painful position of the colonial Churches, which, as I have said, require to be carefully considered before we can arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problem—how they and the Church of England can be more closely drawn together. In the report of the committee, appointed by the Conference at Lambeth to inquire into and report upon the relations and functions of synods, these circumstances are altogether unnoticed, and it seems to be assumed that all the various Churches are perfectly independent. Thus one of the functions which the committee mention as properly belonging to provincial synods, is that of making, or authorising, all alterations in the services of the Church required by circumstances in the province. But, irrespectively of the expedience of investing a provincial synod with such a power, upon which I do not desire to express an opinion, the question, whether, in the face of Lord Romilly's judgment, alterations in the services of the Church can legally be made by any colonial synod whatever, requires to be authoritatively settled. It is the settlement of this question which appears to me most imperatively to demand the immediate attention of the Church in England; for, until it is satisfactorily decided, there can be no security for the maintenance of unity in faith and discipline among the Churches in the colonies.

The first suggestion, therefore, which I would offer is, that there should

be established, with as little delay as possible, a judicial council, similar to, but not altogether the same with, the voluntary spiritual tribunal recommended in the report of the committee appointed by the Conference at Lambeth. The recommendation of that committee is, that such a tribunal should be formed for deciding appeals on points of doctrine from colonial tribunals, and that it should consist of Archbishops and Bishops, to be elected by the Bishops of the several Churches, with certain theologians and persons learned in the law, to be nominated as assessors at every sitting by the president. What, however, I wish to see formed is a *judicial council*, so constituted as to secure the confidence of the colonial Churches, which should be authorised not only to decide appeals on points of doctrine, but also to authoritatively settle all questions concerning the ecclesiastical status of such Churches and their relations to the mother Church, and to adjudicate upon such other matters as might be from time to time submitted to it by any particular Church. The formation of such a council would, in my opinion, more than any other measure tend to preserve the daughter Churches from internal schisms, and to maintain and strengthen their union with the mother Church and with one another. But it must not consist of Archbishops and Bishops only, nor of persons elected by the Bishops of the several Churches. That one so constituted would not be accepted was clearly shown by the "determination" of the General Synod for Australia and Tasmania held at Sydney in 1872, which was, that in a Council of Reference it was proposed to form in England there should be associated with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London, four laymen learned in the law, to be selected from time to time by the synod itself.

Next in importance to a judicial council appears to me to be a well-constituted system of synods. Herein I entirely agree with my right reverend brethren of the Lambeth Conference. Diocesan and, where possible, provincial synods are, in my opinion, essential for the wellbeing of all colonial Churches. Without the former it seems scarcely possible permanently to keep together the Church in a diocese, and without the latter the Churches in neighbouring dioceses will always be in danger of diverging from one another. As, however, the beneficial results of these are now almost universally acknowledged, there is no need to recommend their adoption. But, besides them, in those parts of our empire where nations are rapidly growing up, other more comprehensive synods, constituted on the same principle of representation as the provincial, would, I think, be very useful for enabling Churches in neighbouring provinces to take counsel together and adopt measures for the prevention of any breach of union among them. One such, to which I just now alluded, the General Synod for the Churches of Australia and Tasmania, has been already formed, and is likely, if we may judge from the results of its first session, to exercise a very beneficial influence. Its "determinations," as they are called, were at once accepted by almost all the Churches in those countries. I would therefore further suggest the formation, wherever circumstances permit, of similar *General* Synods.

Nor would I stop here; for I quite agree with the committee of the Lambeth Conference as to the desirableness of a yet higher synod, a synod of the whole Anglican communion. In respect to its constitution, however, as in respect to that of the proposed spiritual tribunal, I would

suggest a modification. For, except such an assembly be composed, like all the synods, assemblies, and conventions now existing in colonial and other Churches, of presbyters and laymen as well as of Bishops, its decisions and recommendations will not have the weight which ought to belong to them. Herein all who are acquainted with the feelings and temper of the Churches in communion with the Church of England will, I am sure, agree with me. I would also suggest that, since many colonial Bishops would certainly be unable to attend, the episcopal, as well as the other clerical and the lay members, of this superior synod should be *representatives,* chosen from the whole number of Bishops in such manner as might previously be determined upon.

In the preparation of this Address my thoughts have naturally been directed chiefly to the Churches in our colonies. With respect to the Church of Ireland, and the Episcopal Churches in Scotland and the United States of America, which are confessedly independent, the only means which I can suggest of more closely drawing them together in a sisterly union with the Church of England, besides the organisation of a General Synod in which they would all be represented, is an increased friendly, mutual intercourse. An interchange of visits, such as those of our esteemed President, the Dean of Chester, Canon Hoare, and others, to America, and of the late lamented Bishop of Ohio and others to England, and the continual passage to and fro of Bishops and other clergymen across the Irish Channel and the Scottish Border, cannot but be greatly conducive to the maintenance of a practical, loving union between the Churches, and to the putting of comparatively unimportant points of difference out of remembrance. I may add, that visits of men of eminence in the Church at home to the Churches in our colonies would also greatly tend to the cherishing in them of that filial love and reverence, which ought to bind them in the closest spiritual union to their ecclesiastical mother.

The Rev. Lord Plunket.

How can the Churches of England and Ireland be drawn more closely together? This is evidently the special question with which, as an Irish Churchman, I am expected to deal.

In reply, let me first say that there are some ties which once bound these Churches, but which cannot now be more closely drawn together, simply because they have been sundered for ever. Such a tie was that covenant to which the Irish Church was a party when for the first time she was united to the Church of England seven hundred years ago. For the seven centuries preceding this union she had existed as a separate national Church, independent alike of Rome and England; but at the Synod of Cashel she promised for the first time "conformity in all divine rites to the Anglican Church," upon the express understanding that her endowments should thenceforth be protected by the State. The two Churches having been thus united beneath the control and protection of the same Crown, were, as is well known, further united by the "Act of Union" at the beginning of this century, under the control and protection of the same Parliament. The Irish Church Act has rudely snapped this twofold bond of union. The Crown and Parliament have receded from

their engagements, and the corresponding obligation of conformity on the part of the Irish Church is, of course, dissolved. No doubt the Irish Church when thus released from her promises might by voluntary act have reimposed this obligation on herself; but if, when suddenly compelled to provide by self-legislation for the new requirements of her altered position, she had bound herself to act in unison with a Church whose every move is necessarily subject to the precarious and tedious intervention of Parliamentary sanction, she would (as every thoughtful man before me will, I am sure, admit) have committed an act of wanton and suicidal madness. So long, therefore, as the two Churches remain as they are—one a voluntary, and the other a State, Church—the tie of rigid uniformity must, I think, be regarded as severed beyond repair.

On the other hand, there are ties which cannot be more closely drawn, simply because they are already, thank God, drawn so closely as not to admit of further tension. And this, as I believe, is true of the tie of intercommunion. One of the first acts of the Irish Church, when separated from the State, was to put on record, in the solemn declaration prefixed to her statutes, her resolve to maintain communion as before with the Church of England; and though the Church of England, on her part, has had many opportunities since that time (especially when the Colonial Church Bill was passing through the Parliament) of restricting the facilities for intercommunion which had hitherto existed between the two Churches, she has deliberately refused, I am thankful to say, to take such a step; and the result, as I have said, is this—that union in this respect is so close that closer it cannot be.

But it is vain to conceal that there is another tie which has never perhaps been strained to the full, and which of late years has, I fear, been allowed to become even somewhat more lax. I refer to the tie of sympathy. Upon this subject I propose to speak with boldness. For though I know that, as an Irishman, I stand almost alone among the members of another Church, I have such trust in the fair play and good will of those whom I address, that I fear not to lose the respect of any one here present by stating frankly that which I believe in my heart to be true. And with this confidence I now say unreservedly, that the English Church as a body has not, as it seems to me, extended to her Irish sister in the hour of her sore trial that amount of sympathy which, under the circumstances, might have been fairly expected. I speak of the English Church as a body,—for many individual English Churchmen (and none more signally than the two English Archbishops) have shown from the first an intelligent appreciation of the difficulties of our position, and have manifested a practical interest in our welfare. But how has it happened that in the case of some others the tie of sympathy has been allowed to hang so loosely? and secondly, can any way be shown whereby that tie may be more closely drawn? In reply to the first of these questions, I would answer, that the withholding of sympathy on the part of some whose good opinion Irish Churchmen would dearly prize has been mainly due, as I believe, not to prejudice, still less to illwill, but to grievous misapprehensions as to what is really the truth concerning the acts and motives of our Church. In reply to the second of these questions, I would answer, that in order to tighten again these loosened cords of love, and thus to draw the two Churches more closely together, all that is required is to make the truth more widely known; for Irish Churchmen, on the one hand, have nothing

to conceal, and English Churchmen, as I have found by experience, are always glad to learn the truth, even though in so doing they should have to cast many a long-cherished preconception to the winds.

This, then, is the general answer which I would give to the question which comes before us to-day. And, acting on the principle which that answer involves, I shall now proceed to review some of those misapprehensions which have, as I know, found currency from time to time among my English friends. If by making the truth known respecting them I should, with God's help, do somewhat to avert similar misunderstandings in the future, I shall feel that the opportunity so generously given me of vindicating the character of my Church has not been used in vain.

Well do I remember, at the time when the fate of the Irish Church Establishment was still hanging in the balance, what strange misapprehensions were afloat respecting the supposed Presbyterian tendencies of the Irish Church, and the extent to which they might be expected to develop themselves in the future. Either the order of Bishops, it was said, would be abolished, or Irish Churchmen, no longer attracted by the financial advantages of a State Church, would betake themselves to the more congenial atmosphere of non-Episcopalian communities. And yet the very event that was to confirm these anticipations has served to dispel them, I hope for ever. Almost the first act of the General Convention was to declare, by unanimous consent, that the Church of Ireland would ever preserve inviolate the three orders of the ministry; and, so far from the Church having since lost ground by secessions to Presbyterianism, the loss, as well as I can learn, has been altogether on the other side. It has, I know, been imagined that our Irish Bishops have been subjected as a rule to grievous disrespect in our General Synod. How easily such a mistaken notion can obtain currency may be explained by a single example. I remember having been myself present at a synod when the Archbishop of Dublin, very naturally, as I thought, felt it necessary to protest against a resolution which he evidently thought was likely to meet with very general support, and which in such a case would have doubtless placed him in a painful and anomalous position. But as a matter of fact, the proposition had never the slightest chance of being favourably received, and was in the end almost unanimously repudiated, having received, as far as I can remember, only twelve votes in a large house. And yet, what was the surprise of all to find in the next day's paper that the Archbishop's words had been commented on by a leading statesman in Parliament, as supplying a proof of the terrible persecution to which Bishops must expect to be subjected in a disestablished Church. Words spoken in Parliament travel fast and far and wide; and though the mistake has been again and again corrected, the explanation has never overtaken the misconception, and the impression still remains on many minds that the Archbishop of Dublin and Irish Bishops generally must have a very hard time of it indeed. For my own part, as one who takes the trouble of reading many English Church papers of very opposite theological tendencies, I venture confidently to assert that Bishops in Ireland at the present day meet, on the whole, with a larger amount of genuine respect, and exercise, too, a larger degree of moral influence than Bishops in England. And I would go further, and say, that if the Archbishop of Dublin is only in the habit of studying certain of these journals to which I have just referred, he will long ago have come himself to the conclusion that, in comparison

with some, at least, of his brethren on the English Bench, he is literally reclining on a bed of roses.

But another misconception has, I trust, been removed. The religion of Irish Churchmen has often been described as a merely negative and political Protestantism. To denounce the Pope, and to do furious battle with every political enemy of their Church Establishment, was supposed by many to constitute the essence of their creed. Well, if this were the case, is it not strange that, when smarting under a heavy blow, the infliction of which was mainly due to the Roman Catholic enemies of their faith, they abstained in so remarkable a manner from anything approaching to vindictive or offensive recrimination, that even Roman Catholic journals, as is well known, were compelled to take favourable notice of the fact, and went so far as to praise in loud terms the spirit in which our Church had met the ordeal through which she was called to pass?

But was it not also expected that party spirit within the Church would lead to dismal results? Was it not openly predicted that the Synod would revive the dying memories of Donnybrook fair, and repeat in history the famous combat of the Kilkenny cats, whose tails alone remained upon the battlefield to witness to the deadliness of their strife? And yet the English *Guardian* (a paper which has always, I must say, dealt fairly by the Irish Church), when commenting on our first General Convention, took special occasion to notice, as a marked feature of its debates, that they were almost wholly free from personalities—that there was an entire absence of anything like party leadership, and that each question was dealt with solely on its own merits. And that such a spirit has in the main characterised all our successive Synods I can myself personally testify. There have, of course, been occasional outbursts of individual eccentricity—there have been occasional seasons of general excitement. Such ebullitions of feeling occur in every large assembly of really earnest men, and are of course just sufficiently sensational to become duly chronicled and widely circulated in public journals which never condescend to record the more ordinary but more prosy doings of common sense and brotherly love. But Time is a great redresser of wrongs. And there are now, I would hope, few English Churchmen who are such laggards in the search for truth as to imagine that such exceptional episodes do really represent the normal character of our Irish debates.

There have been other misapprehensions to which I can only spare a passing glance. The great "commuting, compounding, and cutting" bubble having been duly inflated before the English public by some anonymous scribe, has long ago burst and gone—no one knows where. I need not, therefore, try to recall its pretentious emptiness. But I ought, perhaps, to notice the evaporation of another equally visionary notion. It was, I well remember, prophesied by some, that the mere passing of the Irish Church Act would pour forth upon English soil a flood of Irish deputations, soliciting aid for an impoverished Church, with all those arts of plausible importunity in which our nation is supposed to excel; whereas, I would appeal to my English brethren whether any such order of mendicants has as yet invaded their shores. An English committee is indeed nobly engaged in a spontaneous endeavour to raise funds on behalf of some of our more helpless parishes, and at the request of that committee, or of individual English clergymen, some Irish Churchmen have consented, often reluctantly, to plead the cause of their poorer

brethren in this country. But, in a spirit of self-dependence and self-sacrifice, which perhaps was hardly expected of them, Irishmen have, in this respect at least, shown a desire to rely, with God's help, on their own efforts and their own resources, rather than upon the good-will and the long purses of their friends. And the result, thank God, even so far, is such as to give promise that in this endeavour to manfully help themselves they are likely to meet with no little success.

Nor, perhaps, ought I to forget the fears that were expressed by some, as to the dangers that would attend any election of Bishops or Incumbents in which, according to the provisions of our new statutes, the laity were to be given a substantial voice; and yet three Bishops and hundreds of Incumbents have been thus appointed, and who has heard of any scene which even approaches in its sensational character the election which has recently taken place in the case of a vacant London parish? And, depend upon it, if any such scene had occurred, it would soon have been seized upon as a tit-bit of news by some hungry special correspondent, and widely circulated among our English friends.

And here, in passing, let me add, that not only is it the case that vacant Irish bishoprics and livings can be filled without the necessity of an Irish row, but that there would seem to be the promise of a good supply of clergymen wherewith to fill them. The proceedings of the Irish Church have not been of such a nature (notwithstanding the forebodings of some) as to deter men of good position and cultivated minds from entering her ministry. Such, at least, would seem to be the opinion of two of our Irish Bishops, who have quite recently given it as their experience that no such difficulty had as yet presented itself to them.

But I must devote the few remaining minutes at my disposal to that burning question with respect to which, more than any other, fears and misconceptions have prevailed—I mean the much-vexed problem of Revision. As regards this question, it was, I know, expected by many that Irish Churchmen, when called upon to revel in the excitement of their newly-acquired freedom, would naturally proceed, in the first place, so to lay the basis of their legislative powers as to give that large majority amongst them who hold what are called Low Church views the means of carrying out to the full their own desires. And it was further expected that, such a basis having been once laid, the next step would be such an entire reconstruction of the Prayer-Book as should involve a peremptory condemnation of all those special opinions which so-called High Churchmen even of the moderate school are supposed to hold. Such were the predictions of many as to the aim and probable results of liturgical revision in the Irish Church. How far have they been verified? Why, in the first place, so far from any undue power having been given to the majority in legislating upon such matters, an ultra-conservative provision was at the earliest opportunity introduced into our statutes, which makes it impossible for any alteration of our formularies to become law until it has received the votes of two-thirds of the clergy and two-thirds of the laity given respectively at two successive synods. And if, in the second place, it be asked whether the alterations, which have been since agreed to in accordance with this provision, are of that revolutionary and intolerant character which was anticipated in some quarters, perhaps the best answer will be found in the fact that the course of argument now adopted by the most able and influential opponents of revision in Ireland is to try and

persuade revisionists that they have really gained nothing—that as regards the principal doctrines against which revision is supposed to have been aimed, the Prayer-book remains almost altogether unchanged, and that, therefore, so far as such an aim is concerned, the book will not be worth the printing. That much has been gained by what has been already done—and that if what remains to be done be only carried out in the same spirit, the book will be worth the printing I most heartily believe. But while I thus question the force of this latest argument of the anti-revisionists, I endorse it just so far as it proves beyond a doubt that even in their eyes the work of revision hitherto accomplished cannot be fairly described as revolutionary or intolerant in its character.

It must never be forgotten that this work of revision does not consist (as has been so often supposed) of the hasty and ignorant recommendations of heated partisans. More than four years ago the General Synod unanimously determined that "the time had come for entering upon a complete revision of the formularies in a cautious and reverent spirit." "I take this step," said Dr Salmon (our Regius Professor of Divinity, who proposed this resolution, and who will not, I think, be accused either of ignorance or of party spirit), "under a profound conviction that, whatever be the danger attending the course of action, the danger of doing nothing is vastly greater." The fact is, that he and others had observed the alarm which had been caused among Irish Churchmen by the strange proceedings of certain men in England of very advanced views, and they thought it well that the agitation for liturgical revision which had resulted from that alarm, and which was finding vent in excited public meetings and angry newspaper controversies, should be guided into a safe channel; and, accordingly, the whole question was relegated by a unanimous vote of the synod to a committee consisting of the Bishops and a number of clergymen and laymen chosen by the synod as fairly representing the various views of the Irish Church. It is the scheme proposed by that committee, after two years of anxious and laborious consideration, which has since been under discussion in the General Synod; and whatever has been hitherto adopted does not, let me add, represent any triumph on the part of extreme men. On the contrary, it has been carried through mainly by the influence of a large middle party (consisting of a right and left centre), who have resolved some to yield more, and others to accept less, in the way of change than they might personally have desired, if only by such mutual concessions they might help to preserve the peace and unity of the Church. They are conscious that if a tyrannical majority should succeed in carrying out changes of a revolutionary character, a secession would inevitably take place on the one side. They are equally certain that if a tyrannical minority (for a minority endowed with special privileges such as I have described may use those privileges tyrannically) should succeed in obstructing revision altogether, or in giving it a merely illusory and superficial character, there would be an even greater falling-off on the other. They are, therefore, straining every nerve to avoid both the Scylla and the Charybdis of the present crisis. And while so doing, they look for the sympathy of every man, whether in England or Ireland, who has the interests of Church unity really at heart. And if I be not mistaken, they will not long look in vain. Who can have studied the expression of English Church opinion as it has found utterance during

the course of this very year, without coming to the conclusion that the truth respecting us is at last beginning to be more clearly known, and that, as a necessary consequence, the censures with which we have been visited, not only by some English critics, but also by some even from amongst ourselves, are being weighed in the balance by candid minds, and found wanting? The very fact that, for the first time, as I believe, since the dissolution of our State connection, an Irish Churchman has been invited, in a generous and brotherly spirit, to give information respecting his Church to an English congress, is, in itself, an encouraging and significant symptom. Yes, my English brethren in Christ, the drawing together more closely of our Churches is not altogether a thing of the future. We are being drawn together more nearly even now. To God be all the praise!

ADDRESS.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Tennessee.

I am suffering from too severe an attack of influenza to read a paper, or to attempt more than a very short speech. I can only express the great gratification I feel at being at this great gathering of English Churchmen as a representative of the Episcopate of the American Church, and I am quite sure that you will have less cause to regret this inability to speak on my part, because I see on this platform two representative men of the American Church; the one, Dr Potter, the secretary of the House of Bishops of the Church of America, and the other, Dr Perry, the secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. I am very glad that I have the opportunity of saying a few words this afternoon, as I may be able, of the Church in America, a Church which owes its plantation and long years of nursing care to this Church of England, a Church which is not only in communion with the Church of England, but is one with it in faith, in order, and in discipline; and we recognise in the President of this Congress the man who has done the most to draw close together the cords of this unity and friendly intercourse. Twice, inspired by an apostolic fervour, he has crossed the Atlantic to weld together and make brighter the links of this fraternal intercourse, and he has made us (of America) feel, perhaps more than any other man, that we are all builded together in Christ Jesus on the one foundation. Bound together as we are by ties of blood, and by a common language, we cannot over-estimate the importance of our having the same worship, the same Common Prayer, and being at one in all the holy offices of our common religion. I am sure that the President of this Congress, and all the members of it, must feel a generous pride in the strength and the prosperity of that branch of the Catholic Church which this Church of England planted in America; and I am quite sure that we in America most heartily and most thoroughly rejoice in all the evidences of the grand revival which this old mother Church is to-day manifesting to the world. For our branch of the Church in America we may hope that there is a great future. Everywhere, as the broad fields of our territory are peopled, our Church rears the standard of primitive truth and apostolic order. Within a century of national existence there have been gathered on our shores some forty millions of people. The plough is rapidly bringing the continent under the necessities of a civilised life; the railway opens rivers through the forests and

across the prairies over which the argosies of commerce are sweeping with a fiery speed. In all the elements of muscular strength our progress has been most marvellous; but it is for the Church of the living God, a Church at once primitive, catholic and apostolical, to give to us a higher, a truer, and loftier civilisation than we ourselves have yet dreamed of, and put the mark of Christ's cross on our national brow. These two branches, or sister Churches as they are called, need to be drawn closer and closer together in practical work. It is true that we as a people have inherited our language from England; it is true that we have inherited our trial by jury, our common law, our judicial independence, and that principle which underlies all true liberty that the consent of the community is essential to just taxation, a principle which was settled here in England, when "the high-souled priest confirmed the barons' vow;" but I most feel that as sister Churches, we need to be drawn more closely together in practical work. Twice, my brethren, I have been asked in England—"Do the people in the United States speak English?" and that by people in classes of society among whom Bishops in England move. Now, there are one or two ways in which it strikes me, that if there was this positive, practical, hearty co-operation we should be greatly benefited; but I cannot detail them now. I will not hesitate, however, to say that if there was this hearty and constant co-operation in all Christian work, and in all Church work, the matter of the revision of Holy Scripture would be in a more desirable position than it is at present, when there are some men who will not be satisfied unless everything, as the preface to King James's translation has it, may be beaten out on their own anvil. Since I have been in England, I have received a communication from the Primate of the English Church, asking me about the organisation of an independent Church, the Church of Hayti with one Bishop, a Bishop ordained by the Church in the United States, but of whom the Archbishop of Canterbury knew literally nothing, and he had to seek information from me who happened to be in England. Now, how are we to be drawn together? The papers read here this afternoon indicate that we are to be drawn together through the instrumentality of a Lambeth Conference, God grant we may! The last Lambeth Conference has been stigmatised by some one on one side of the water or the other as an Episcopal tea-party. I do not know why Bishops may not have a tea-party. I think it has not come to this pass yet that Bishops may not have a tea-party, and I do not hesitate to say that if another Lambeth Conference is drawn together, and the mouths of men are free to speak for the several branches of the Church of Christ throughout the world, it will be something more than a common tea-party. But when we seriously consider the present condition of the Church throughout the world, and the wonderful intellectual activity of our day and generation, and the demands made on the priesthood as well as the Episcopate; we must feel, that we, as Churchmen, have much to do in setting forth God's truth, and in promoting the visible unity of the Holy Catholic Church, and I believe, as the President of this Congress has said, this Anglican Church is yet to be the bond of a restored unity throughout the Church. I am very far from being an alarmist, nor do I sympathise with the man who is an alarmist. I hear men say that there is a crisis. Well, the Church is always in a crisis. The Church is always ailing, now in the head and now in the heart, "always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus;" and religion seems to be just expiring. Strife and heresies abound on the right hand and on the left; and yet in spite of all the liberal indifference and the scoffing; in spite of all the cold sharp criticism; in spite of all the downright rationalism, which we see on the right hand and on the left, there never was a day when there was more real spiritual life, or a

deeper earnestness of religious feeling, or a time when the cause of our dear Redeemer grasped the hearts of men and moulded their life and conduct, more than the present; and we may very well doubt, whether there was ever a time since the schism between the East and the West, when the divided state of Christendom caused such deep feeling, or when so keen a sense of the necessity of the unification of Christendom has possessed the various branches of the historical Church of Jesus Christ.

Men may argue about it as they will, but the unity is to-day as it has always been a definite and substantive part of divine revelation, and, as it has been well said by one of your English writers, who has done so much to promote personal holiness here and in my land (I mean the Dean of Norwich)—"the great instrument in the design of Christ for the conversion of the world, is not so much *preaching* the gospel as the spectacle of a Church united in the truth, and fulfilling our Lord's prayer 'that they may all be one . . . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.' Let this Anglican communion throughout the world show a practical and real unity, and the nations of the earth will be blessed by it, in all ages that may be yet to come. Then, brethren, why talk about being discouraged, or disheartened? I think of the fact that when the branch of the Church which I represent, received the Episcopate from this Church, there was not a Bishop in all the world outside of England who traced his succession through the see of Canterbury; not one; and yet, to-day in all the islands of the sea, in all the continents, all the colonies of Great Britain, in all our states and territories this Episcopate has been set up, and we may doubt if there has ever been such a revival in any one direction as there has been within this Church of England during the last forty years. There is every reason for us to take courage and march forward under the banner of our dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Moved and penetrated and interpenetrated by the Divine Spirit, let this Church, unbound and free, march forth to conquest amongst the nations of the earth.

DISCUSSION.

Mr T. F. Dickinson.

I came here to-day feeling that this subject was the most important that could be considered at the Congress, and I had some doubt and fear as to how it might be treated, lest there should be things proposed which it would be impossible to carry out. I am happy to say that has not been the case, but his Lordship has asked me to say a few words on the importance of this subject, and I am very glad to do so. It seems to me that a word which fell from Lord Plunket, to the effect that sympathy was the thing that ought to unite different parts of our Church, was the material thing. The same idea has been dealt with by the Bishop of Tennessee when he talked of the bond of union between our sister Churches. There can be nothing more important than that this Church of England should be one; but it cannot be made one by any machinery that can be devised, or by any court of appeal, such as that suggested by the Bishop of Melbourne. No such court of appeal could compel obedience to its decrees. The real thing is sympathy between the different branches of the Church and the toleration of differences. A long appeal has been made by Lord Plunket for sympathy. The "anonymous scribe" whom he denounced is my brother-in-law. I am sorry to bring anything personal before you, but I must say, in defence of the man who has been attacked here, that he has been an honest man,

endeavouring to do his best to prevent the small remains of the endowments of the Church from being plundered. I do not approve of what has been done in Ireland, but this I say, that even if those things had been done which have been talked about as being done—even if the alterations in the Prayer-book are made, still I ask you not to throw the Church of Ireland away from you: I ask you to tolerate differences as much as possible, because I believe it is wise to do so. I believe the prospects alluded to by the Bishop of Tennessee, that our Church will be the bond of union in the future, will be somewhat at variance in her different parts. If one part goes a little too high towards Rome, it may be a bridge in that direction; andif another part is too low, it may be a bridge for, say, the Wesleyans on the other side. Thus the development of truth through our Church will proceed and extend in a way that has not been witnessed for many a day. I hope it may be so; I have great confidence that it will be so. I was sorry to hear in one of the hymns sung this morning, an expression of fear for the future, for I think we need have no fear. God is with us, and if we hold together, our future will be bright and happy.

Rev. Dr Potter, Secretary to the House of Bishops in America.

I HOLD in my hand a paper which has been given to me within the last ten minutes, on which are written in the handwriting of the President, these brief and imperative words—"Dr Potter, five minutes." I was a Bishop's son in the flesh before I was a Bishop's son in the ministry; I have, therefore, learned to obey my Bishop, and I rise in response to the impulse of such obedience, but also I must own with no little dismay. I had not the faintest intimation that I should be called on to say a word in this hall to-day, until I came upon the platform, and I need hardly remind you that you require no supplementary voice from the other side of the Atlantic, after that to which you have just been listening. If the Bishop of Tennessee, suffering under the affliction he has mentioned, can make his voice ring through this hall as he has done, what must be the tones he sends echoing and re-echoing across the western prairies when his voice is in its normal state? My mind has, however, been set to work by the suggestive papers which have been read, and two or three practical points have occurred to me; which, perhaps, I may venture to mention—"How may the Church of England and sister communions be more closely drawn together?" That is the question proposed for our consideration this afternoon. If it is not possible, as one of the speakers has intimated, to have such a synodical organisation as has been referred to by the Bishop of Melbourne, still it has occurred to some of us to ask whether it is not possible to have a sort of commission, which should be made up of representatives of the Church of England, our mother Church, the Churches in the colonies, the Church in America, the Church in Ireland, and that Independent Church in Hayti, to which the Bishop of Tennessee has just alluded, to which might be referred, from time to time, questions of common interest to them all? Those who have not to do intimately with ecclesiastical bodies, are not, perhaps, aware how constantly questions arise with regard to these different ecclesiastical bodies, *e.g.*, as to what shall be the *status* and position of the clergy when they come from England to America, or go from America to England; as to how days not provided for in the Church's Calendar, such as the Day of Intercession for Missions, shall be appointed, and how many other matters of international ecclesiastical discipline (if I may use the term) may be fixed and determined. Those who are in high places

in the Church, Archbishops and Bishops, in America have been frequently embarrassed by such questions as these; therefore, may we not hope to have such a representative body of Bishops, clergy and laity from the Churches in all parts of the world, who look up to the Church of England as their mother in the faith, as shall enable us to be more of one mind in our methods of working, and more closely banded together in a common fellowship? We have been reminded by the Bishop of Melbourne, that these independent Churches in Ireland and America owe nothing to the Church of England in the way of allegiance, but his Lordship must have meant that they owe nothing in the way of *legal* allegiance. We in America are never willing to forget that we owe to her our constant love and reverence; that we owe the unfailing and undying gratitude which we must always cherish towards her, who, in our weak days, was our tender nursing mother. No remoteness can ever make us forget that, and no distance or remoteness can make us indifferent to suggestions which, eminating from her chief ministers, might be weighed and commended to all the Churches by such commission as I have suggested. Again, may I suggest to my brethren of the clergy, that it would contribute a great deal practically to union and the feeling of brotherhood, and the more intimate fellowship of the Church of England and her daughter in America, if clergymen in this country would be careful to see to it, that emigrants to America from their parishes were supplied with letters of recommendation to American clergymen? I know very well that the position of a member of the Church in England and in America is very different. Here, in a sense, every one is a member of the Church of England as by law established; and, therefore, in a certain sense is under the care of the incumbent of the parish; but it is not so with us. We only have charge of those who acknowledge us as their ministers; and I am sure that those who have come from England, with even the scantiest recommendation to an American clergyman, will admit that they have met with the most cordial and tender welcome. I venture to beseech you to make it an easier task for us to do our duty towards those wandering children of yours, who from time to time come to our shores, by giving them letters of recommendation from your hands. Finally, I would repeat the suggestion that the Churches in England and America may be drawn more closely together, by precisely such an intercourse as took place for the first time in the experience of the American Church, when the Bishop of Lichfield visited that Church in 1871. I do not think it is easy to exaggerate the influence of that visit on the American Church. Party spirit ran high everywhere, and yet there was none who went away from the General Convention who did not feel that the presence of the Bishop of Lichfield, not only gave us an impulse in the direction of more cordial enthusiasm in regard to the great matter of Foreign Missions, but also contributed almost more than any other single influence to unify and draw together the divided hearts of those who came to the General Convention of 1871, with fear and trembling. If then you would help us to draw nearer to you, and thus to contribute to the more intimate communion of the mother and daughter Churches, send us from time to time one of your Bishops, send us more than one of your eminent presbyters. It was our privilege in 1871, to welcome not only the Bishop of Lichfield, but also the Dean of Chester, so widely known and honoured in America, as well as several of the clergy of this diocese. May we not hope, oftener, to hear on our side of the Atlantic the eloquent tones of men whom we only know by their writings? If we can teach them nothing more, we can at any-rate teach them that there abides in the heart of every American Churchman, a feeling of constant, and unswerving, and ever-deepening love and reverence for that English Church, which we rejoice to remind ourselves is, under God, the mother of us all.

Mr Beresford Hope, M.P.

I must begin with particularly thanking our President for the reference he made to the Bonn Conference. It would, indeed, have been a very deplorable oversight, if this great Congress had met and parted without a greeting on its part for those who met there, and a welcome recognition of so momentous an event in the history of Christendom. I can use no less expressive term; that conference was an exceptional event; and let me point out in what way it was so. We have all been thinking much in church and in this hall of the development of our Church throughout the world, and its extension in our colonies, in heathen countries, and among the independent Churches in communion with us. But that is, so to speak, the expansion of a single body, the memory still might remain of the sneer which our enemies love, to wit against our Church, that it was the Church only of one nation; this to be sure was being falsified every day, yet the fact did seem to stick, that while our communion was extending in every direction it was mainly the Church of men descended from a common nationality. That charge will no more be imputable. Look at the Bonn Conference; look at the way in which foreigners, men who have been brought up hitherto in the misleading teaching of the Roman schools, have come to appreciate the position of the English Church. This is the point to which I desire to call your particular attention, and the theologians who have now come forth from Rome, and from whom we are now receiving justice, are men who have taken that step after a lifelong training in the misrepresentations of Church History, which the Vatican has for generations been so liberally infusing into the minds of its votaries. When once the wall is thrown down, when once a body, small though it may be at present but of enlightened men—deeply instructed, continental divines—are able to look at the English Reformation, as it is, in its true traditional and historical character, and when the Eastern Church is able to appreciate that same Reformation as it is, an advance towards unity has been compassed, such as has never been realised before. The English Church is thereby put in a position to work towards the unification of Christendom, on primitive Old Catholic, not Roman, nor yet Puritan principles. We have seen at Bonn the beginning of this process; that great work at Bonn claims its recognition on the part of a body like this Congress. Your Lordship has given it, and all English Churchmen will thank you for what you have said.

One more point before I sit down; Lord Plunket appealed to English Churchmen to show more sympathy with the Irish Church than it has hitherto done. Personally, I have taken a special interest in the Irish Church. I have laboured for it in various ways with which I will not trouble you in detail; and I claim what few Englishmen have a personal right to do, to speak for the Irish Church as a sympathiser. Let me tell Lord Plunket how he may secure that sympathy for the Irish Church which he claims. Let the Irish Church have the courage to own "*Mea culpa;*" let us in England be satisfied that the faith of Christ is openly expressed by the Church of Ireland in its public worship in the unmutilated words of the three Catholic Creeds. Let us hear that, and neither Lord Plunket nor any one else will have cause to complain of want of sympathy on the part of the English Church.

The Venerable Archdeacon Reichel (Meath).

Mr Beresford Hope has thrown an imputation on the Irish Church, of which (though an Englishman myself) I am an unworthy member and office-bearer, which I cannot allow to pass unanswered. He has imputed to us the repudiation of one of the

Catholic creeds. Of course, it must be known to the majority of this Assembly that what Mr Hope means is that the Irish Church in its last Synod, by a very large majority—a majority of two-thirds of the Bishops, of two-thirds of the clergy, and two-thirds of the laity, determined that the so-called damnatory, or minatory, or condemnatory, or warning clauses, by whatever name it may be chosen to denote them, of the Athanasian Creed shall no longer be read in the public service of the Church. But it may not be known to the majority of those present, that that Creed is retained in its entirety in the new Irish Prayer-book, that it is referred to in its entirety in the Eighth Article of the Church ; and it may also not be known that the charge of dispensing with one of the safeguards of Catholic truth might with, I might say, much more justice—but I would rather say with equal injustice, in both cases—be made against the great Episcopal Church of America, which has excluded the Athanasian Creed from its public services, from its Prayer-book, and has excluded all reference to it from its Eighth Article.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, 5th OCTOBER.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Lichfield took the Chair, in the Town Hall, at Three o'clock.

WOMAN'S WORK IN THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

PAPERS.

The Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewer.

The work of sisterhoods forms one main part of "Woman's Work," and, within the last thirty years, has attained an appreciable magnitude in the Church of England. And it is to be noticed, that all our sisterhoods are working orders, some having been formed for their work's sake, others, formed for the sake of the religious life, having also undertaken active work. It is not possible to give any adequate idea of the amount of influence exercised by sisterhoods in the progress of Church life, but the institutions and special services undertaken by them may be measured by their statistics, and we may thus gain an approximate estimate of what they are doing. With this view I have endeavoured to ascertain the aggregate amount of such work as can thus be estimated at present carried on by eighteen of our sisterhoods, which occupy ninety-five houses, great or small, as the centres of their operations.

Hospital work, penitentiary work, care of children, Mission work in home parishes or abroad, are the chief objects to which sisters have devoted themselves. Taking together these eighteen sisterhoods, there are under their care, of sick or helpless, including convalescents and incurables, upwards of 1000, besides three large London hospitals entirely committed to their charge, and an average of 690 cases of the upper and lower classes annually nursed in their own homes ; and of nurses under training by them

there are 210. Of penitents, including a small number of Magdalens—that is to say, penitents consecrated for life under a penitential rule—there are about 500. In one case 1075 penitents have passed through the house since its foundation, two-thirds of them having remained in it two years. Of children, including orphans, industrials, and school children of higher and lower grade, there are under regular teaching about 6000. In five of these sisterhoods pupil-teachers and mistresses are being trained, and, in addition, in guilds, or confraternities under their guidance, there are upwards of 2000. A large amount of spiritual aid is also given in opportunities for retreats for persons living in the world; in the case of one sisterhood as many as 238 persons in the year have received special individual care in retreats. In two of the sisterhoods printing is taught as a lucrative occupation for women, and in three there are important schools for Church embroidery. To these numbers are to be added about fifty parishes with their various machineries, and some foreign Missions.

In considering such details, it must be borne in mind that sisterhood work almost always implies progress; for there is scarcely a religious house amongst us that is not continually adding to its existing works or opening out fresh centres. It costs much to found a religious community, but once founded it becomes a nucleus around which continually gather various forms of Christian zeal and enterprise.

In order to understand the value of sisterhood work, we must consider what a sisterhood is. A sisterhood, as distinguished from other kinds of associated communities of women, implies a vocation to live and work wholly and undividedly for God, as a permanent state; an aptitude for devotion and useful service; a religious rule; fellowship in prayer and work binding all together; a gradation of offices with recognised authority; rights and customs carefully guarded; and a systematic way of adapting the capacities and dispositions of the different members of the community to the necessities of the work undertaken. The organisation becomes complete when, through the Bishop's sanction, the seal of the blessing of the Church is set upon it, and some of our existing sisterhoods already have this high privilege. But it must be borne in mind that, according to Catholic use, religious communities may, without any irregularity, work independently of Episcopal sanction till circumstances have favoured their obtaining the formal approval of Church authority. Sisterhood work, therefore, realises the highest idea of Christian work, for it is founded on self-sacrifice, and sacrifice is the noblest principle of work. It is also dependable and constant, because a sister's service is a life-long dedication to God, and as love to her Lord induces a woman to become a sister, her work is throughout animated by love, and love gives to Christian work its over-mastering power and attractive influence.

When compared with the work of individuals, the superiority of sisterhood work is shown in this—that the work of individuals continually fluctuates, is subject to perpetual change, and ever liable to fail. On the other hand, community work is independent of individuals. As the tide of the sea ever advances on, though the waves rise and fall, so it is with community work. Vacant places are filled up as vacancies occur. The work continues, though the individual workers fail, or prove unfitted for their charge. The sense of individuality in a great army is but accidental to the general movement, and so it is with sisterhoods.

CHURCH of the PACIFIC

In another respect sisterhood work resembles the movement of an army, for one main principle of its effectiveness is the law of obedience. As the centurion says of his power—"I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it;" so is it in a sisterhood. While special aptitudes and dispositions are considered, and obedience is due not so much to the person ruling as to the rule, yet in all sisterhoods there is necessarily submission to authority for conscience' sake, and orderly co-operation under one head, and consequently there results an unfailing power of adapting the supply to the need, of meeting emergencies, of covering details, of supplying deficiencies, of preserving harmony, of remedying faults,—such as cannot possibly be attained except by an organised body having various gifts, but one spirit, and acting according to rule under a recognised executive.

Sisterhood work, moreover, ensures a constant growth of experience. The fact of many minds being brought to bear on the same subject, with one end in view, and animated by religious earnestness, necessarily gives to woman the power of employing, with the greatest advantage, her peculiar gifts of perception of character, of aptitude for detail, of quickness of invention. Sisters are ever accumulating practical knowledge, to be the possession of the community, living and growing as the community lives and grows, and thus becoming a tradition, to be taught and acted upon in successive generations; so that the work of established sisterhoods is the uniform carrying out of a settled system founded on ever lengthening use, its individual members being thus saved from the defect almost necessarily attending individual workers—viz., the having to learn by means of their own failures, and sacrificing the objects of their care by ever fresh experimentalising.

A sisterhood also provides a help of the extremest moment for real work, hardly possible to be attained otherwise—that of training. There are two kinds of training—general and specific. For general training, preparatory to the specific, and forming the basis of character, there is no better school than good family life. What makes the groundwork of a good daughter or a good wife equally lays the foundation of a good sister. But it is only the groundwork. To turn to account in a new sphere the good qualities thus matured; to become apt in religious duties; to do the particular work required with the greatest efficacy; to work harmoniously with others, whether in posts of authority or of subordination; to move at ease and with freedom in the midst of difficulties and responsibilities which attend especially works touching souls, and the spiritual interests of other beings, and co-operating with God in His design for them—this requires training of a special kind, and is the only means of preventing the sure waste of time, of talent, of energy, of hope, which is the universal regret of all inexperienced beginners, and the sure marring of much earnestness and zeal.

If, moreover, woman is to do her best in the work of the Lord, and put forth her whole powers in His service, she must be free and unfettered. The relations and ties of this world are indeed part of the order of the Divine government for the accomplishment of God's purposes; nor need there be rivalries, or a Pharisaic spirit—"Stand apart, for I am holier than thou"—between the different vocations which are alike necessary and equally ordained of God. But there is an Apostolic counsel about a

woman "attending upon the Lord without distraction," and "caring for the things of the Lord, how she may please the Lord," and being "without carefulness." And the Phœbes and Dorcases of Apostolic times were thus wholly and undividedly given to do the work of the Church, undistracted by social calls or family ties, or any outward hindrances; and surely those can do more, and more effectually, for the spiritual and bodily needs of the lost, the helpless, the suffering members of Christ's body, who have given themselves wholly up to His service, not merely having a single eye, which is the characteristic of all true Christians, but a single aim, because of an entire concentrated devotion? And who can be so disattached, so undistracted, so simple in the concentration of their energies, as members of religious communities, where as a first principle there is a division of labour, and each member is responsible for the one appointed task for which she has shown herself to be most fitted, and all is made to give way to what has become a consecrated rule of life and a religion? Nor can there be a question but that there are works to be done in the kingdom of our Lord, which can be effectually done only by those who are thus wholly set apart, offered up as living sacrifices burning with the zeal of one absorbing desire; and specially among such works are those which have been mentioned—hospitals, penitentiaries, and the care of children and Mission work, whether among the heathen abroad or the scarcely less heathen at home.

It is sometimes thought that sisterhood work is sentimental, and the fancy of an exaggerated enthusiasm. Like other works, it must of course be judged by its fruits and the objects aimed at. But if work be successful, it is scarcely compatible with mere undisciplined enthusiasm, for immediately we begin to work, we come across facts and realities, which, to be rightly dealt with, depend on the use of common sense and the exercise of cool judgment. And although sisters, like other persons, are subject to the infirmities and imperfections common to our race, yet sisterhoods have the best means of sobering and disciplining the judgment, because there is among sisters the most free and open correction of error, and the most constant endeavour to instruct and to guide according to an ever-enlarging experience.

I have been led to speak of sisterhoods only on the side of work, because the subject given constrained me to limit my remarks to this view. But I would guard against the supposition that the work of sisterhoods can be independent of their life. There are not a few persons who admire and wish for the work of sisters, who yet love not, or dread, their life. But to expect to get the work of sisters without the nourishment of their spiritual life, is to expect the bricks without the straw, or to look for the kindling of the Virgin lamp without a constant supply of oil.

In conclusion, considering the great power exercised by sisterhoods in accomplishing some of the chief works committed by our Lord to His Church, it becomes, as I believe, a duty to encourage their formation in the Church of England. And in order to further this end, I would suggest the following brief points touching certain questions at issue —

1. That a sister's vocation ought to be recognised, not as a mere useful mode of spending her energies, but as a calling of the grace of God, like other spiritual ministries within the kingdom of Christ, to be followed for His dear sake.

2. That the subject be pressed on the attention of the Church's synods, as a legitimate and most important part of the Church's system.

3. That a generous freedom ought to be allowed in the organisation of religious communities, supposing always that they are true to the Church of England, because to have real life and power they must needs take various shapes from the difference of the mental constitution, experience or views of their founders.

4. That sisterhoods are not to be regarded as casting any reflection on other forms of life or service, least of all on family life, which is the source and nurse of all that is pure and beautiful in human society, but as a distinct state to which some are called, partly for their own greater personal holiness, partly for the sake of their fellow-creatures, whom, in the love of Christ, they can better serve when thus set free from all other claims.

The Rev. Arthur Gore, M.A., Hon. Canon of Chester and Vicar of Bowdon, Cheshire.

I have been asked to write this paper, because I have had some practical acquaintance with deaconess-work. To this form, therefore, of woman's ministry I shall limit myself, touching upon others only where they touch on this.

I am happy in the title of our subject, "Woman's work in the service of the Church," because it supplies as exact a definition of a *deaconess* as can be desired.

A deaconess is a servant of the Church, and she is nothing else.

I make this point clear, partly to remove objections sometimes alleged, though not really lying, against the office, and partly because the revival of that office is among the best results of the *Church-life* new born in our day.

First, the definition—and it is in the words of the Holy Scripture*—removes what is felt by some persons to be an objection—namely, that the Female Diaconate is but a stepping-stone to the Sisterhood, and even that the Deaconess is but the Sister under another name.

A greater mistake could not be made. Opinions may and will vary as to the comparative value of the work of deaconesses and sisters, but intelligent advocates of either system will confess it to be quite distinct from the other. The Sister is of the Sisterhood, the Deaconess is of the Church. The Sister, wherever she works, lives under the fixed rule of her Community administered by the Lady Superior; to this she submits her will, by this her obedience is regulated, in the Community her innermost life has its spring. Its ministering priest is her spiritual superior. He, and not the parish priest, connects the life of the Sister with the sacramental life of the Church. If the sanction of the Bishop be sought, it is only that his blessing and commission be given for work *according to the fixed rules of the Sisterhood.** A Sister, therefore, in coming into a parish, does not take her place freely as a parochial officer. She is under prior obli-

* Rom. xvi. 1.

gations, and obeys another rule.* She is the servant and representative of the Sisterhood, not of the Church. Whatever the merits or demerits of the system, I notice it only to point out that it does not express the deaconess idea at all.

The Deaconess is the free unfettered servant of the Church alone.

But then, she *is* the servant of the Church; not of Christ in His Church, but of the Church of Christ. I need to say this because the name is becoming popular, and is sometimes used with undue latitude. Of its use outside the Church I do not speak, except to give emphasis to the fact that Dissenters have now a lively sense of the importance of the work of trained women; but within the Church we have reason to complain of the adoption of the name by and for those who have received no official sanction or appointment. Yet I do not refer to this irregularity in a hostile spirit. It is a healthy sign for the movement that a wild and spontaneous growth should be seen side by side with that which is the result of cultivation. It declares distinctly that the time for the work has come. The less regular operations may be the consequence of impatience—some would say natural impatience—at the slowness with which the Church moves; though experience generally shows that slow and deliberate movement is productive of safest and most abiding results. Nor, indeed, shall I be surprised to find a readiness on the part of the promoters of these private schemes to submit them to the direction of the Church authorities. They will remember that the "Deaconess" from a private Institution, however widely its rule may differ from that of a sisterhood, stands in a parish on the same level with the sister. Both are private workers carrying out systems of their own, and not commissioned officers of the Church, promoting hers and only hers.

It is then needful to unfold the definition, *Servant of the Church*, into the one identical in substance, but more explanatory, which has been adopted by both the Archbishops and eighteen of the Bishops of our Church:—

"*A Deaconess is a woman set apart by a Bishop, under that title, for service in the Church.*"

To which definition are added the following rules:—

Relation of a Deaconess to a Bishop.

(1.) No Deaconess or Deaconess-Institution shall officially accept or resign work in a Diocese without the express authority of the Bishop of that Diocese, which authority may at any time be withdrawn.

(2.) A Deaconess shall be at liberty to resign her commission as Deaconess, or may be deprived of it by the Bishop of the Diocese in which she is working.

Relation of a Deaconess to an Incumbent.

No Deaconess shall officially accept work in a parish (except it be in some-non-parochial position, as in an hospital or the like) without the express authority of the Incumbent of that parish, which authority may at any time be withdrawn.

Relation of a Deaconess to a Deaconess-Institution.

In all matters not connected with the parochial or other system under which she is summoned to work, a Deaconess may, if belonging to a Deaconess-Institution, act in harmony with the general rules of such Institution.

---

* See *Report of Church Congress*, 1862. Paper by Rev. T. T. Carter, p. 130.

Probation.

It is essential that no one be admitted as Deaconess without careful previous preparation, both technical and religious.

Dress.

A Deaconess should wear a dress which is at once simple and distinctive.

Religious Knowledge.

It is essential to the efficiency of a Deaconess that she should maintain her habit of prayer and meditation, and aim at continual progress in religious knowledge.

Designation and Signature.

It is desirable that a Deaconess should not drop the use of her surname, and with this end in view it is suggested that her official designation should be "Deaconess A. B." (Christian name and surname), and her official signature should be "A. B., Deaconess."

It may be of advantage to add the Form of Admission used by the Bishop of Chester :—

"*The Bishop standing, and laying his hand on the head of each candidate for the office of deaconess,*" pronounces this benediction :—

"God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, bless, preserve, and sanctify thee ; and so fill thee with all faith, wisdom, charity, and humility, that thou mayest serve before Him to the glory of His Great Name, and the benefit of His Holy Church, and mayest in the end attain to everlasting life, through the merits and mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen."

On these terms and in these words consecrated to her office, holding, too, the Bishop's licence in her hands, the Deaconess, although unpledged by any save her baptismal vows, will not readily abandon the work to which she has been so solemnly called.

Secondly, I have said that the revival of the Office of Deaconess is the happy result of the new-born life now pervading the Church. That life, spontaneous, self-regulated, impatient of delay, manifested itself at first in Societies of like-minded men and women, which did not become, nor seek to become, co-extensive with the Church. Sometimes intentionally, almost always in fact, they represented various shades, forms, schools of thought, opinion, doctrine, and so gathered to themselves not the whole body of the Church, but sympathising groups within her pale. But their life and work within her have aroused her to life and work, and now, in the parish, the diocese, the nation, in the vast empire of the Queen, the Church of England is felt, and being more and more felt and recognised, as a mighty power labouring not any longer in groups only and societies of her children, but herself—a strong, well-regulated army pressing forward the kingdom and dominion of her Divine Lord and Head. It is of this Church, living and labouring, that the Deaconess is the handmaid—not of a Society within her fold, but the messenger of the Church herself ; not one who ministers to the Church but one by whom the Church ministers not a few of the blessings of the Gospel of peace.

For in recovering the Female Diaconate, the Church is recovering the use of at least one of her hands.

I will justify this assertion by a glance at the Deaconess in her chief field, the parish. I shall write only what I have seen and known. In the parish, then, she interferes with no other agency. She is the helper of all, the hinderer of none. Around her gather teachers and visitors. Without her, their labours, however assiduous, are broken and uncertain. She supplies the thread of continuity, not only by meeting exigencies her-

self, but by her knowledge and tact in obtaining suitable help. She has her place in the Mothers' Meeting, in the Sunday-school, the Day-school, the Night-school ; her business among all classes, even the roughest and rudest of the lads. Her parish room, with its comforts, even its luxuries, its delicacies and refinements, is a home of brightness, a fairyland of order and good rule, in many eyes, to many hearts. There, many a simple is administered, many a blister and bruise assuaged and bound, many a child's life saved. Into it the rich—well content—give of their abundance ; from it the poor learn the helpful, gentle, elevating influences of Christian love. In some sense it is their room, as the Deaconess is their servant "for Jesus' sake." Few are the cares and sorrows withheld from her confidence, few the distresses in which she does not share. With them always, particularly in sickness when others shrink, and ought to shrink, at the dread words typhus, smallpox, cholera, scarlet fever, she is at hand, the Church's messenger of mercy in their fear and woe. To the pastor she stands somewhat in the relation in which the trained nurse stands to the doctor. He is the head, she the ministering hand, defter, more delicate in actual treatment, more continuous in vigilant care. Through her he has the confidence of his people, the knowledge of their difficulties and wants. By her his hold is strengthened on young men and maidens as they leave school, and particularly during the perilous days succeeding confirmation. And, not seldom, she can accomplish more than he when sin assumes its most hideous and brutal shapes. I have said she has her place in the day-school. I should dwell more at length on this department of her work did I not hope to hear the matter treated with her accustomed skill in Miss Yonge's paper, from listening to which we shall presently derive so much pleasure. One word only must I speak. I do not believe that our primary schools will ever be taught aright until women of the highest refinement be employed as teachers. This lack the servants of the Church must supply.

I will not follow out this theme. I will also pass by many other interesting aspects of our subject. I will not touch on Church history, nor need I. Bishop Wordsworth and Dean Howson have abundantly vindicated the claim of the deaconess to primitive and Apostolic authority. The sources of information are open to all, easily read and understood. The Dean has laid the Church under further obligation by his account of deaconess work in Germany and by his consistent advocacy of its adoption in England, and so well has he fulfilled his task that he has left to his successors nothing which they can add to strengthen his position. Upon him chiefly devolved the responsibility of piloting the cause through its earliest and most dangerous stages, and under his guidance it has escaped most of the difficulties which seemed to threaten before the actual experiment was made. On one only among the old topics is it necessary to continue the emphasis which it has always received. It must ever be carefully borne in mind that the deaconess pledges herself by no new vows, relinquishes no personal rights, remains possessor of her own property, violates no domestic ties, and is, even, ready to resume her place among her kindred if at any time it shall appear to be the will of the great Head of the Church that she should do so.

Two problems remain to be solved—Whence shall come an adequate supply of these Church-servants? How shall they be trained for their work?

This is a favourable day in which to ask these questions. We have long known that even thousands of English women are compelled by conventional rules to lead idle, unprofitable lives. We know now that there is a disposition spreading and strengthening among women themselves to break down the barriers which have impeded their usefulness. The earliest efforts to give effect to this determination may sometimes appear unwomanly, ungentle, even grotesque. But they are not to be mocked at. They are evidence that women have been held too long—some of them, perhaps, paralysed—under unnatural restraints.

Now, to a large extent, the Church has in her hand the remedy for this evil, and by applying the remedy she can draw to herself that strong woman-force which is ready for development. She wants the systematic help of trained women, and here is the supply ready to her hand, pressing itself, indeed, earnestly on her attention. What hinders, when the need is so urgent, and the energy so great? Old hindrances are fading out of sight, prejudices are breaking down, the office is becoming better known and understood, is taking its place more naturally in the Church system, is rapidly emerging from the region of crotchets, and coming more completely every day into that of common sense. All that we want now is, that the Church, in her newly-awakened life, with her rapidly maturing powers of organisation, should herself declare that she has need of this work, and should put her public *imprimatur* upon it. We are thankful to know that deaconess-houses already exist in six dioceses,* and that they enjoy the cordial approbation of their respective Bishops. So far, they solve our second problem, for in them candidates for the office may be fitly trained. But they have in them a danger against which I know that their officers are anxious to guard. They are still, in too great a measure, private institutions. We ask public recognition for them. We maintain that the supply of deaconesses is only second in importance to that of the clergy, and that it demands the attention of the Church in an all but equal degree. How shall this be aroused? I answer, the promoters of this work must draw nearer to one another. They have been too much apart in their labours. There has not been that pull altogether which, with the blessing of God, would secure success. We must now form joint plans of action; we must bring our institutions into harmony; we must publish the opportunities they afford; we must ask for the voices of the Bishops (and I am the bolder to say this, because my own Bishop has led us in his diocese in the most generous way); we must force this want of the Church on Convocation; we must, in a word, carry out whatever measures may be needed to remove the cause of the deaconess from private to public hands. The work must be of the Church in all the catholicity of that word. It will perish, and deserve to perish, if it attach itself to any party, or call itself by any name save that of our common Mother. It must reflect every hue of thought and feeling which is loyal to the Church of England. It must be flexible in her hand to do her service to the nation and the world.

* *Diocese.*	*Post Town.*	*Deaconess.*
London,	London,	E. Cassin.
Winchester,	Dorking,	E. Ferard.
Chester,	Chester,	M. Fitzmaurice.
Rochester,	Maidstone,	Hepburn Lyall.
Ely,	Bedford,	F. Eagles.
Salisbury,	Salisbury,	Aldred.

For, be it remembered finally that, useful at home, the deaconess will prove of tenfold use in the Foreign Mission field. There is no time to speak of heathenism, but through the vast region where the Cross is in conflict with the Crescent, where women are secluded from all ordinary access to the knowledge of the glorious Gospel of Christ, is it not a reproach that the Church has not her handmaids ready to bear these tidings into their prison-like abodes? If we think of the power she might wield thereby, of the influence she might gain by the Christian education of children, if we think of the wife and mother won by the Church-servant to the beneficent sceptre of Christ, if we consider what our own homes would be if the mothers of England were without Christ and without God, then, perhaps, we may estimate the work which remains to be done, the field which asks to be cultivated and which can be cultivated by no other agency than this.

At this day, then, in this Congress of the Church of England, now that preliminary difficulties have cleared, or are clearing away, like the mists of the morning, I ask that the Church shall arise to her great office, and send forth her daughters as well as her sons to the help of her Lord against the mighty.

Miss Yonge.

The following paper was read by the Rev. C. W. Bond :—

"Behold the handmaid of the Lord!" should be the spirit of every Christian woman. According to His call and to her own gifts must be her service, from that of the nurse or schoolmistress who does the work to that of the lady of the manor, who can do no more than assist with her purse, her encouragement, and, if she have the faculty, her superintendence. In one aspect she scarcely seems to be a parish worker at all, and yet her co-operation and interest make so great a difference to the spirit of the place that she is often the mainspring of the whole.

Parish needs divide themselves into two chief kinds—namely, the care of the elder, and the training of the younger. It is of the latter, that is to say, of education, that I shall venture to give a few conclusions, formed partly from personal experience, partly from observation.

It is not, as formerly, a question depending on clergyman, squire, or lady, whether cottage children shall learn at all. There is no choice but that they should receive as thorough an education (as far as it goes) as any schoolroom can furnish—in many cases a much more thorough one. The points at present left to be determined in each parish are, whether this education shall be merely secular; whether it shall be what is called unsectarian, and thirdly, whether it shall be merely formal, without spirit or efficiency?

The first question seldom disturbs a country parish. The second is generally decided by motives beyond the control of ladies. Where a school board exists they will, however, make themselves more useful if they can be elected to take part in it; and if they are able to give their assistance in teaching all that follows (except what relates to the Catechism) is as applicable as it is to the voluntary schools, which are, happily, the rule in agricultural districts. The special work of ladies in schools seems to me to be to keep up the tone and spirit of the religious instruction, by working at it under and with the parish priest.

Training schools have done much for schoolmasters and mistresses, and they are for the most part excellent scholars in divinity, well instructed in the manner of imparting knowledge, and much better disciplinarians than any one untrained can be, without great natural gifts. But they cannot be teaching all the classes at once, and the limitation to a single hour makes it needful to leave some classes to pupil-teachers and monitors, who ought themselves to be under instruction. Though the greatest and holiest minds have not disdained the first lessons to Christian babes, it was their greatness and holiness which deepened and brightened their teaching; whereas, from a young boy or girl, such lessons are in danger of appearing trite and tedious by constant repetition, and, even where irreverence is avoided, dulness and technicality are almost inevitable in young paid teachers on these subjects.

The clergy have already perceived this disadvantage, and given their time towards mitigating it; but there is much need that ladies should also take classes during that morning hour of religious teaching. Every pupil-teacher thus set free is so much gain, and an equal gain is the division of children, preventing the time and attention of the more advanced from being wasted while the younger are dragged up to them, and the younger from growing inattentive to the teaching that flies over their heads. A still greater advantage is the stimulus and sense of importance to studies which, not being profitable in this world, are sometimes regarded with indifference by teachers, parents, and scholars. The evil of the roll-call being made after, instead of before, them is greatly lessened if the children know that their presence or absence is observed by those whom they love and look up to. And as secondary motives are needful to lead to primary ones, it is well to have a system of rewards, independent of secular progress, and for punctuality and diligence in religious studies.

Diocesan inspection does something in this way, but it necessarily deals rather with whole schools than with individuals, and it cannot do more than give hints, encourage exertions, and manifest deficiencies. And at the very best, all mechanical schemes have the disadvantage of rendering religion a subject of "pass and class," rather than of heart and practice. It is far, far better that it should even so be learnt than not at all. The dry bones can thus be placed ready, as it were, for the Breath when it shall come and make them live; but in the awful balance of evils which attends on all we do or leave undone, the "blaze of light, light without love," is one painful effect of the teaching which is technical alone, and gives knowledge which puffeth up, without charity which edifieth. The unpaid labour of love is one of the best aids in avoiding this, though, of course, there is no entire preventive.

It is true that no one can do so much for a school as the master or mistress, and where their instruction lacks the inward spirit, or their discipline is weak, the external influence of visitors seems hopeless, and, perhaps, is so with the mass of the school; but there will be always individual children on whom it will tell, and in itself it does much to prevent the spirit of indifference from growing on the teachers. There is no saying how much good can be infused by being taken for granted.

It is well at the same time to give hearty interest to the secular lessons, treating them as the children's duty, while keeping before their eyes that no progress in these can atone for irreverence or ill-conduct. There is sure

to be some department in which assistance will be welcome, from knowledge which, though often less accurate than that fresh from the training school, can hardly help being wider. Prints illustrative of the children's reading, and, above all, small curiosities, give immense delight when shown, and a mistress will hail them as useful assistants. The poetry which has to be repeated to the inspector also affords a field in which a lady's help may be welcome, and her eye over the often-neglected needlework is especially valuable. Above all, however, is the influence that her opinion, praise or blame, has on the children, and the civilisation and refinement which come unconsciously through intercourse with her. That the parents and children feel this is shown by the uniform preference of borderers on two parishes for the school which receives the most of such tendance, even though there be no material advantages connected with it. Of course, the lady, even if on the board, or a manager, will only make her visit useful and welcome if she respects the dominion of the mistress, and puts herself at her disposal, not interfering with the time-table, doing what may relax the discipline, or finding fault with a teacher in public.

In dealing with the higher classes both of day and Sunday schools, a considerable amount of knowledge is now requisite. The cultivation which the upper standards enjoin, and the stimulus to all the faculties of the children, make it due to them that their religious knowledge should be in proportion. It is true that knowledge of Scripture history and geography is not religion, and that familiarity with the sacred text may be that of the Pharisees. But it is also certain that many souls can only be reached through the intellect, and that to minds of more activity than devoutness, a lesson taking the line of devotion or exhortation is simply a weariness. Moreover, the importance of a subject is sure to be rated by the pains it costs and the interest it excites. All that can be brought to bear on the subject should be employed: historical reading, Palestine researches, the best comments, illustrations, anecdotes bringing the application to real life. If religious instruction be thus made one of the brightest and pleasantest lessons, there is a hope of its taking hold of the minds of some at least of the children.

The subjects for the weekly school are Scripture history, and where it is possible, the Catechism and the Prayer-book. The Catechism, with its perfect rule of faith and practice, is that on which the most stress of all ought to be laid, and no child should be allowed to pass out of our hands without having had its teaching as much unfolded as possible, and knowing the words too well to forget them. If this cannot be done in the week, it must be done on Sunday, but otherwise the Sunday-school is better occupied with the subjects of the Sunday itself, for one reason, that this gives the best chance of connecting associations with the services that will recur through life. Great care should, however, be taken to hinder elder young people from thinking that they are hearing the same thing over again. The reading of one First Lesson each Sunday can be made to cover a cycle of three years, and thus avoids too much repetition. Psalms, or other portions of Scripture, should be selected for learning by heart, with reference to the Sunday, and taking care also that those should be chosen which will be the most precious and comfortable through life. There should also be some clear explanation of the distinction between Church and dissent, not so reiterated as to lead to party spirit, but recurr-

ing once or twice in the child's school life, so as to prevent it from being entirely unaware that schism is a sin. Another great point is the teaching and enforcing of private prayers, which, in the ruder class of poor people, are sadly neglected, and till the children learn to pray, we have done *nothing*, absolutely nothing, while, if they pray, all the rest will be given.

Much has been said of the strain and weariness of Sunday-schools to village children. My experience is the reverse. With lively teaching, repetition of lessons prepared beforehand, and correction of answers to questions in writing, and with some reading aloud in conclusion, it is easy to make the Sunday classes an enjoyment. I would suggest, however, that all need not begin at the same time. The younger classes may be allowed the run of the playground and of their own schoolroom, while the elder ones are already employed on what they can enjoy.

This plan would be well to adopt where any local industry, such as glove or lace making, keeps many girls at home, so that there is a class whose sole day for instruction is Sunday, and who find it a real holiday to sit quiet and be taught. They ought to form a class by themselves, and if possible be taught in a private room, and less by questioning than by reading and discoursing to them; or giving out questions to be answered in writing. This is a most desirable branch of work. The girls are of an age to appreciate attention, their feelings are awake, they attach themselves eagerly, and the mere fact of having some one to care for them will often save them from that state of giddiness and vanity which too often begins the downward course.

Service, is however, a far safer condition for them, both as shielding the girls from temptation and instructing them in womanly duties; and one important item in a lady's work is to find good places for the elder girls, instead of leaving them to the first small tradesman's place found by the market woman. The success of a few good girls both opens a number of safe situations to the rest, and encourages the parents to wait for the lady's recommendation; but the great difficulty is, that so few mistresses or upper servants will consent to hire a girl at the age at which it is needful that she should go out, and thus she is obliged to work up through the low, rough kind of places, where she is in danger of losing all her religious habits. Thus a very useful work in villages is to have young girls in training in the house, one or two at a time, from the period when they leave school till they can get a good situation. The difficulties in the way are, first, that the upper servant must be thoroughly imbued with a sense of the act of charity, which chiefly depends on her, to make her consent to bear with the girl's deficiencies; and, secondly, that some are sure to fail. No one can tell without a trial whether a girl will have temper or energy to stand the training into the new style of nicety and civilisation she finds required of her; and the most intellectual girls, being apt to be the least handy, are the most disappointing. But the gain of those who do succeed is so great, and the work so useful, that it ought to be attempted whenever it is possible. It is far better than any servants' school, because in these the industrial training can hardly help being so mechanical that there is no preparation for imperfect apparatus or emergencies. When once at service, the Girls' Friendly Society affords a most beneficial means of having the young maid-servants still cared for in their situations.

Many agricultural parishes contain hardly any girls who have left school, all being at service; but, on the other hand, these are full of farm lads, who have become their own masters just at the age when gentlemen's sons are going to public schools. They are apt to make themselves the despair and the scandal of the authorities, unless some one can win their hearts.

Night-schools do something, and ladies who have the power of controlling these rough spirits are most valuable there; but even more useful seems to be a Sunday class, either in the afternoon or evening, according to the time of the service. The boys do not know what to do with themselves on a Sunday after church, and the well-disposed are delighted to be taken off their own hands. It is better to have them in a room in a house than in the school, for the more they feel themselves treated as men the better they will behave. The age for admission to the class should be as late as possible, for these lads are far more manageable after they are old enough to develop a certain rough chivalry than when their manhood only asserts itself by impatience of feminine control. And if a lady cannot gain their willing obedience by gentle and genial influence she had much better let them alone, for successful rebellion and resistance to her only make them so much the worse by fostering contempt for her as woman and as lady. Hero-worship of some man, either lay or clerical, who understands them, or even order under the strong hand, is then far better for them.

The pupil teachers are often in need of help from the ladies of a parish. Some departments, such as music, languages, or botany, might very well be carried on by them, and would be a great relief to the master or mistress. Religious instruction might also thus be undertaken, and such teaching, being in private, and to intelligent young people, would be in the power of many who could not endure the wear of teaching a whole class in school.

Music is one of the branches in which ladies' assistance can be most valuable. Taste, feeling, and refinement are elements which only cultivated persons can infuse. Where there is a thorough musician among the clergy of a parish, or where there is a superior organist, a lady's assistance is superfluous; but in most small parishes good choirs can hardly be kept up without such aid. Where the schoolmaster is organist, he can indeed teach the lesser boys; but after they have once emerged from the daily school, their sense of emancipation makes them unwilling to submit to him, and the men regard themselves as on an equality. The conceit, which is the besetting evil of the highly respectable men who usually form the staple of village choirs, can be much better dealt with by a lady than by any one else. They have a natural deference to her, and unbounded trust in her musical knowledge, and her courtesy of demeanour renders concessions much easier to them—for it need not be said that she will treat them as if they were gentlemen. Choirs thus trained—if the lady have the needful qualifications—are almost sure to sing with more reverence, more expression, and more refinement than those left to the schoolmaster. It need not, however, be said that in all these cases the lady must be careful to remember that she is only acting as the delegate of the parish priest, and must never put her plans and opinions in competition with his, or she will produce nothing but mischief, even though her knowledge be superior on any subject.

Woman's work in these matters may be reckoned as of two kinds, professional and amateur. That of sisters, deaconnesses, and schoolmistresses is, of course, professional, and so, to a great extent, is that of the families of the clergy, and of such other persons as are able to make their parish work their great object; while amateur work may be reckoned as that which must stand second to other duties, to family and friends, and which is necessarily irregular.

This last must not be undervalued. Whatever is the *best* we can do will be blessed and accepted. A few weeks or days of vigorous aid from a fresh hand is a spur and refreshment to all. It may be just what some laggard spirit needed, or may awaken some responsive chord which the regular workers have failed to touch. Visits, examination gifts, treats from those who cannot bestow regular time and attention are great helps. Influence is a more useful thing than actual instruction, and to learn to love and look up to a lady is a most softening instrument. With a view to this, I would suggest that, besides the regular school treat, a rough affair on a large scale, it is well to have a class at a time to drink tea with all the little graces of detail observed at our own houses, and to amuse them with the pretty things, photographs, &c., of the drawing-room. It is a highly appreciated pleasure, and very civilising.

The value of influence is, that it teaches people to act for themselves, and sets them in a straight course, and thus the lady who has set things on a good footing, and taught her boys or girls to go on well in her absence, has done a work that may last them for life. Lads are, we should say, best in the hands of unprofessional teachers, provided they can be fairly regular in their attention for the time. The big boy, or youth, will be much more ready to attend to a bright-looking, well-dressed young lady, than he will to a sister or deaconess, whom he will view as a continuation of the schoolmistress. And as many parishes are constituted, the example of the squire's family, and the knowledge that religion and charity are the actuating motives at the great house, will be the most effectual means of leading the population in the right direction. The uncertainty of all amateur aid is, however, the disadvantage. Illness, marriage, the needs of relations, and the removal of families, call off the best workers in full career, with no one to supply their place. Thus, it would be well if some permanent arrangement could be made by which a pair of thorough professional workers could be secured to each place. Two sisters or two deaconesses might live together, one to attend to the schools, the other to the sick. Where it is possible; one might be a certificated mistress and the other a trained nurse; and while the one had the charge of the school, the other could attend to the sick, either at their homes, or at a cottage hospital. Pupil-teachers might be gathered round the one, girls training for service round the other; and in conjunction with the clergy they would know how to apply such aid either in gifts or practical work, as other persons might offer in teaching or district visiting.

This is, however, a mere theoretical suggestion. Most persons can only do such work as calls for them most immediately, and trust to Him who gives it to them to do, by the course of His good Providence, that "as their day, so shall their strength be."

Mr Carleton Baynes.

The many and various associations now existing for woman's work of Christian love, prove that the need of them is deeply felt; and some important results achieved by women, as well as some special classes of Christian work which all agree are only well done by them, prove that here is much important work requiring Christian women to do it.

While, however, it is clear that Christian women want the work, and that Christian work wants female workers, and while so many secular employments are being laid open for women in professions and public offices, which, a year or two ago, were confined to men, why should there be so strong a prejudice against opening to women a recognised religious career, although the scarcity of curates is loudly complained of, and it has been said by a clergyman of high standing and long experience that a deaconess is often worth two of them?

The existing associations for woman's work in the Church appeal to the public for support on their own merits, and are therefore obliged to present themselves in the most attractive form, although that may not be the form in which the greatest amount of good can be done with the least amount of risk and expense; for the public must have something to look at; it can see and understand a crèche, an infirmary, or a convalescent home, so these works are often attempted in preference to the less showy, but, perhaps, more spiritually profitable work of a parochial deaconess. The whole question, however, bristles with difficulties and dangers; and for this very reason the aid of our Church is specially needed, to guide and support such associations, so as to keep them from excesses in doctrine and practice, and to give that assurance as to permanence, which is essential to their very existence.

Your Honorary Secretaries requested me to bring before this Congress the excellent woman's work conducted by Mrs Pennefather at Mildmay.

This institution was founded in 1860 by the late Rev. W. Pennefather as a training house for female missionaries.

The object of the founder and his friends was the development of woman's ministry in the Church of God, and they based their operations on these two principles—1st, That skilled labour is likely to be more efficient than untrained energy and unregulated zeal; and, 2d, That it is possible to develop woman's powers for practical service, in a happy communion of love and labour without enforced vows, or the distinctive rules and characteristics supposed to belong to conventual life, and the fifteen years' experience they have had has deepened their conviction of the truth of these two principles.

Their small beginning prospered; many ladies came from several parts of Europe, and when trained went to some of the most important mission fields of the world. An educational branch of this work is now carried on at Clapton, where a sound and liberal education is given to 84 pupils, principally daughters of clergymen and professional men of small incomes, who it is hoped may in their turn become teachers of others.

In the grounds of this branch institute is an infant school for children of the more educated classes.

The special work of the Mildmay Deaconess' House has always been to

supply additional helpers to the poorest and most densely peopled parishes of the metropolis where voluntary workers are seldom to be found, and it forms the centre of a group of twelve other mission stations scattered over the north and east of London.

The first of these outlying missions was established at Bethnal Green at the time of the Cholera in 1866, when the Vicar of St Philips accepted the offer of the late Rev. W. Pennefather to assist him by means of his trained deaconesses.

All the large rooms under the Mildmay Conference Hall are used by the deaconesses for the benefit of the neighbouring poor, for mothers' meetings, clubs, sewing classes, Bible classes, and tea meetings, &c.

One work which has been specially valued, is a large night school for working men, superintended by the secretary of the hall, but instructed entirely by the ladies.

The instruction given comprises, besides reading, writing, &c., geography, short hand, and mensuration, and elementary classes on scientific subjects.

The evening is always closed with Bible reading, singing and prayer. The average attendance is 130.

Another highly valued work is the invalid kitchen, for supplying the poor with suitable food in times of sickness and convalescence.

The Mildmay Deaconess' Home comprises also a reception-house where visitors may spend a short time before becoming probationers, a training house for 16 probationers, where 10 young girls are also prepared for domestic service under a resident deaconess.

The work of nursing is so engrossing, and the training for it so difficult, that it has been found better to allot to it a separate Nursing Home with its own lady superintendent.

The deaconesses complete this training at Guy's Hospital, and, as far as their numbers will admit, they undertake nursing in the homes of the rich and poor.

They also have charge of the Accident Hospital at Poplar, of the Hospital for Incurables at Cork, of a small cottage hospital at Sudbury, and of another at Doncaster.

Near to the Nursing Home are the Cottage Hospital, and the Invalid Home ; the former contains 10 beds and the latter 14.

There is also an Orphanage for children of respectable parentage, which at present accommodates 20 children.

Besides these various London establishments there are two small branch houses worked in connection with Mildmay, one at Brighton, where four deaconesses are employed, and the other near Reigate, where two deaconesses usually work, and a House of Rest is now being established near Reading, for the benefit of the London workers.

All the deaconesses are expected to take the Holy Communion at St Jude's Church whenever they are able to do so.

In the Mildmay Deaconess' establishments there are at present 56 deaconesses, 16 probationers, and 30 professional nurses.

They rent 23 houses besides the Deaconess' House and premises, and the expenses exceed £4000 a year.

An important association of female workers, which originated at Mildmay, has since spread far beyond the limits of this country.

Its object is to promote the study of God's Word, and an increasing habit of prayer, both socially and in private. For this purpose prayer meetings and Bible classes of Christian women are formed wherever it is practicable, each one of such meetings being looked upon as a basis and nucleus for an association of workers.

This organisation has extended to Scotland and Ireland; independent centres are being formed in Edinburgh and Dublin, and offshoots have sprung up in Northern India and Australia.

There are now between 800 and 900 members of this fellowship, and a branch association, especially adapted to invalids, now numbers 308 members.

Having now briefly described the work of the Mildmay Deaconess' House, you may reasonably ask me, Is this a Church of England institution? and I would ask, in return, How can I possibly answer such a question?

To use Mrs Pennefather's words, the Mildmay Deaconesses' work as ministering women is in connection with the Church of England, but ever bearing on their banner "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

If, however, an association for woman's work selects a clergyman of the Church of England, whose religious opinions are identical with its own, and places itself under the direction of that clergyman, does it therefore become a *bona fide* Church of England institution? I think not; and it seems to me that Church people greatly need some practical safeguards against erroneous teaching in associations of Christian women.

There is no difficulty in finding out what are the distinctive doctrines taught in any of our churches, but it is very difficult to learn as much about an association of women before absolutely entering it, and I think we have the strongest claim upon our Church to provide some sufficient guarantee that if a Churchwoman enters an institution admitted to be distinctly Church of England, she shall not be in danger of finding that doctrines are taught there which are not recognised by the Church of England, that there shall be no fear of her being led to think on the one hand, that ordination is a matter of very little importance, nor of her being taught, on the other, that all her strength for Christian work arises from the real objective presence in the Holy Communion, and in the efficacy of auricular confession.

Whilst sisterhoods are doing a great amount of good, and the devotedness of many sisters cannot be overrated, there is in them a want of that inalienable attachment to the Church of England which should distinguish all the Church's recognised organisations.

A deaconess being a recognised official, the institution to which she belongs should not perish by the withdrawal of its members, but its Church life should go on by other accessions, in the same way that the Church and its ministry exist and continue.

Deaconess' institutions have therefore a special claim upon our Church's fostering care, and while they trust to that care, they should cling to each other with sympathy and affection, and assist each other by every means in their power, especially in times of trouble. But without our Church's fostering care such fraternity is impossible; for how can the deaconesses of one institution be recommended to combine with those of another, when

it is suspected that doctrines are taught in that other institution which are not recognised by the Church of England?

The statement of principles and rules agreed to in 1872, and signed by twenty of our Bishops, is a valuable memorandum for the guidance of all Church Deaconess' institutions, but it fails to specify any conditions by which they might be recognised as strictly Church of England. If such deliberations as that of 1872 were repeated, and heartily supported, they might at least lead to an agreement upon the terms of some comprehensive clause, to be inserted in the trust deed of every Deaconess' Home which desires to be recognised as a *bona fide* Church of England institution.

In most of such institutions the Bishop is the visitor, and it is a great advantage to have such a means of final appeal; but Bishops sometimes differ widely in opinion, and to secure uniformity of decision it would be well if a statement of principles were agreed upon as the basis of such final decisions; so as to inspire that mutual confidence which is so necessary for hearty co-operation.

It must also be remembered that this visitorship is no check upon a community which is unanimous in going to extremes, for in that case, no appeal would be made to the Bishop. The setting apart of deaconesses, the visitorship, and the statement of principles are great helps to the movement, but far more decided action is required from our Church, if woman's work is to be made a recognised Church work throughout the land.

The existing institutions have struggled against open and secret enemies, amidst difficulties from within and from without; and can it be wondered at, if failure and disappointment, not to say discredit, has nearly broken the hearts of some of its most ardent supporters? The Liverpool Church Deaconess' House, which started under the best auspices, the position of the deaconess being well defined, and her relation to the governing body being clearly fixed, in a manner hitherto unattempted, gave grand promises of success; but troubles came, and this Liverpool institution fell to the ground, without any help from its mother Church or from its sister institutions.

At Salisbury, the Deaconess' Institution has been founded by the Bishop himself, and although the advantages of such a circumstance may be great, yet even this is dearly bought when we reckon the drawbacks arising from such a complete dependence on one leading spirit, for it is very doubtful if such a one will train a successor, and still more doubtful if the trained successor will succeed.

Where, then, is our guarantee for any permanence in such work? A monetary provision may be made for the maintenance of deaconesses when past work; but important as that question is, the permanence of the work itself is greater and more difficult to insure.

The Maidstone Church Deaconess' Home seems to give more assurance as to definite Church teaching than any other Deaconess' Institution, having been founded by the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, whose principles are clearly stated, and whose bond of union is to uphold the principles of the Reformation.

Every Churchman who is not ashamed of the Reformation, of the Martyrs, of the Catechism, and of the Thirty-Nine Articles, can be a member of this alliance. And this Deaconess' Institution has been established as a wit-

ness that women as devoted as any sister in Rome can be found to labour honestly, *within* the lines of evangelical truth and apostolic order, as maintained by the Protestant and Reformed Church of England.

It has been often said that Church Congresses are barren of practical results, but I trust that our Church will now take such action in organising deaconess' work, that this Congress will form a remarkable exception.

Is it not unfortunate that while those associations which fly to either extreme are well supported, those which cling with loyal affection to the Reformed Church of England are looked upon coldly from either side?

Is it not unfortunate that one of our leading Deaconess' Institutions, after some years of work, should be unable to say what they did or did not believe, and should have to call in the aid of their Bishop to draw up a statement defining the avowed religious opinions of the institution.

Is it not unfortunate that ladies, desirous of devoting themselves to Christian work, should be led to abandon their project because they have sought in vain for an institution affording any definite guarantee that sound Church of England principles, and none other, would always be fostered in it.

Such Christian ladies and such Deaconess' Institutions now ask for all the support and guidance our Church can give them. The present time affords our Church an opportunity for making one grand institution for deaconess' work; if this opportunity is neglected, and woman's work in the Church falls into the hands of large independent societies, as is beginning to be the case, the time may come when such independent societies will be so strong, that our Church will be unable to organise woman's work as one great Church work; may such a time never come!

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. Canon Tristram.

We have had three ways set before us by which woman's work may be done in the Church, viz., by sisterhoods, by the female diaconate, and by individuals. I will, however, refer only to the two former. It seems to me that nothing is done by sisterhoods which could not be done and done equally well by the Deaconess' Home. Sisterhoods have no advantages which deaconesses have not; but at the same time there are evils connected with sisterhoods from which Deaconess' Houses are free. We have been told that following Catholic usage, sisterhoods may work without authority for a time, and until they can gain Episcopal sanction—that is, that they are independent communities, and may act in defiance of the constituted authorities of the Church, till those authorities are forced to yield to them, but that is not the principle of Deaconess' Houses. In that respect, therefore, I believe the Deaconess principle is more "Church" than that of sisterhoods (applause and some hisses). I am not aware what I said to evoke those hisses (applause and cries of "Go on"). I understood that every speaker has a right to express any opinion so long as he does not trench upon the bounds of courtesy towards previous speakers. I trust no speaker will be deterred by those sounds from expressing his opinion. I will, however, support what I said by quoting the words of one who certainly will never be hissed in any meeting of Churchmen, and I will tell you whose words they are after I have read them. "I could not have felt at liberty to take any part in the arrangements

of any sisterhood of which vows for life formed a part; because, first, I see no warrant for them in the Word of God; secondly, because it seems to me that our Church has certainly discouraged such vows; and thirdly, because it seems to me to be really of the essence of such a religious life, that it should be continued, not because in a moment of past fervour a vow was made, but because by a continued life of love, that life is again freely offered."*

Those are the words of Samuel Wilberforce, uttered at the Oxford Church Congress in 1862; and not one syllable of them ought to be forgotten. It is a very serious thing to be told, and I ask how far it is in accordance with the Church of England, that penitents to the number of 500, as we have heard, should be consecrated for life under rule. That they should devote their lives to God is well, but to consecrate them for life under rule is surely contrary to the idea of the Church of England. No doubt sisterhoods have advantages over individuals in certain kinds of work by the continuity of their system, but Deaconess' Houses might be equally continuous, and more practical than sisterhoods. Churchmen ought therefore, in my opinion, to be extremely careful in even seeming in the slightest degree to sanction one of those things, the abuse of which in past times has been one of the greatest scandals of the Church of Rome. We have been edified by an able commentary on the apostolic counsel about women "attending upon the Lord without distraction," but we should remember that there is another text from the same Apostle which runs—"I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, and guide the house."

Rev. C. F. Lowder, M.A.

I had hoped that after the three first papers this meeting might have ended without any discordant sounds. I hoped that those papers would rather have had a different effect, and that by setting before this meeting such a wonderful variety of woman's work, the daughters of the Church of England would find their hearts drawn by the grace of God to enter upon some branch or other of the work which suited their individual inclinations. I do not believe that there need be any jealous rivalry between the institutions described to us. When I heard of institutions from which I should differ in many important points I listened with the greatest interest, and I was delighted to find there were so many daughters of the Church of England ready to devote themselves in different ways, even if I could not altogether approve of them. I was glad to find so many called to do God's work, but I would remind you that it is a call, and while I rejoice that there are so many divers ways for women of serving God, and while I think there need be no rivalry, I must say that I believe the highest life is that described by Canon Carter's paper. When I heard of the wonderful progress made by sisterhoods during these last years I could not but feel that God's blessing had been abundantly poured out upon that work. The devotion of the sisters themselves, and the wonderful skill and energy with which they have been enabled to carry out their purposes of love and charity, are not less remarkable than the advance of their institutions now open all over the country; and I feel most thankful to God that Canon Carter should be able this day to give such an account of progress and successful labours. When I heard the next paper I was also glad to find that the deaconesses were succeeding in their work, although I do not throw myself with the same cordiality into the deaconess movement as I do into

* Bishop Wilberforce at the Oxford Church Congress, 1862.

that of sisterhoods. As I have already intimated the first qualification for sisterhood is a call from God to the work, and without a woman feels that she has a vocation, she ought not to undertake a sister's life. But to those whose personal characteristics and ideas might not be suitable for sisterhood, the work of the diaconate may present itself under a more congenial aspect; and they can devote themselves to God's work as deaconesses. Again there are many who could not join either of these institutions, and they will find, as indicated in the practical paper of Miss Yonge, that there are schools, village hospitals, district visiting, and nursing institutions, and work of all kinds in which ladies may take an active and useful part. Perhaps to some, the very variety of work set before them may hinder their sense of an individual call, but each one rather ought to feel that in such a variety there must be a place for her—there must be something that she can do for Christ.

The Venerable Archdeacon Ffoulkes.

I will occupy the time allotted to me, in giving some account of a convalescent home and children's hospital at Rhyl, in North Wales, and of the woman's work done there, unconnected with any sisterhood. I agree with the last speaker that there are many women ready to devote themselves to God's work and anxious to serve Him, if they only knew how. This institution was commenced in 1872, in a small hired house, and from a humble beginning has grown in a way which not only showed that God's blessing was upon it, but that it met a want much felt in the country. It was a sea-side hospital as well as a convalescent home, under the charge of a lady superintendent, who, with three other associated ladies, gave themselves gratuitously to the work, which they conducted with the aid of three or four trained nurses. One thing which they had specially in view, was to take in ladies to be trained for hospital work. In the two years during which it has been fully at work, eleven ladies have entered it as pupils, to learn hospital work, during periods of time varying from two to five months; and of the eleven who have been so trained three hold themselves ready to return at any time of emergency when their help might be useful. Those ladies so trained go back to their own parishes in various parts of the country to reproduce the good work they have learnt at Rhyl. Some clergymen have sent their daughters there to be trained, that they might be useful in their own parishes. There are a sitting-room and bedrooms for the children of professional men, for there are many such who are in as great need of this kind of help as working-men. That part of the institution was not fully occupied yet, which enabled them to take in additional ladies to be trained as nurses. I am sure that very few persons have an adequate idea of what may be done by good nursing, and how much suffering and weary lives might be saved by it. It might be said, that this is not a religious house, but it is so practically, for the work is done in the best spirit of religion; there is a chapel in which the ladies gather the children, day by day, for prayers; a chaplain comes once a week to catechise and instruct them, and the whole tone of the house is as thoroughly religious as could be desired. The bonds that unite the inmates together are those which spring from a love of Christ, and of the good work for Him that they are engaged in.

I may mention (to show the value of good nursing), that during the two past years we have received four cases pronounced by medical men to be unimprovable or incurable; and yet all of them have been entirely restored to health, and three have expressed their desire to be allowed to remain in the institution as nurses. I

believe that in England the value of careful intelligent nursing is only beginning to be understood. There is, I know, a splendid institution in London for training nurses; yet what are they for the number required, and how little can they assist the poor? At Rhyl, we take in the children of the working classes to be nursed to health if it be God's will, and so we reach multitudes that could not otherwise be relieved. It is, in my judgment, a species of woman's work worthy of the highest consideration for those who do not feel that they have a vocation for a sister's or a deaconess' life. It is hoped that from this institution may go forth in future years many devoted servants of Christ, who shall further this blessed work for Him, through the various parishes of the kingdom.

The Rev. W. Cadman, M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Marylebone.

The rainbow, which has just appeared in the heavens (pointing to the windows, from which a large section of a remarkably vivid rainbow was visible to all present) at the close of our meeting, is a beautiful token of God's favour which seems to me very encouraging. It is the token of God's covenant of mercy, and by that sign now, He seems to assure us, that for the sake of Him who died and rose again, while we seek to do His work, we may depend upon His promise—"I will bless thee, and make thee a blessing." When we then recognise God as our Covenant Father, there is a cheerfulness in His service, which makes us, whatever our position or circumstances or difficulties, "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." We then go to it, not from a sense of duty only, but because we are constrained by love. I confess that I have been rejoicing, during our meeting, in the thought that these Congresses have greatly improved in spirit and tone; and I cannot but trust that it was in a moment of unwatchfulness, that some persons allowed themselves to hiss when a speaker said, as he had a perfect right to say, that while he approved of one mode of woman's work, he disapproved of another. For myself, certainly I can say that there were certain expressions in all the papers which I rejoiced to note. The first, while advocating certain things respecting which there are serious differences of opinion amongst us, put in the condition, "supposing always they are true to the Church of England." In the second also was the phrase "loyal to the Church of England;" and another paper advocated the union of evangelical truth with apostolic order. These are expressions which go to my very heart. And for any work loyal to the Heavenly Master, and true to the Church of England, which as a faithful Church protests against error, whilst advocating the truth of Christ, I say may God's blessing be on it. I believe that women have a great work to do for Christ, but do not think they are only just beginning to do it. Let us not forget to bear testimony to the self-sacrificing, self-devoted work carried on for so many years by district visitors, Christian nurses, mission women, teachers in our schools and the like. I myself can bear witness to the labours of our godly mission woman, who for nineteen years has been to me as it were my right hand in parochial work, and she and those associated with her have been and are always ready to visit cases of sickness, no matter how dangerous the disease or how wretched the locality. While, therefore, I rejoice to find woman's work now openly recognised, I cannot forget that God has been preparing for it, and blessing it these many years past, and I hope the time has come when the great influence of women will be more generally devoted to the glory of Him who has promised to bless us if we are only faithful to Him, and to His truth.

TUESDAY EVENING, 5th OCTOBER.

The Right Reverend the President took the Chair in the Congress Hall at Seven o'clock.

WHAT CAN THE CHURCH DO TO COUNTERACT DRUNKENNESS?

The President.

Dear Friends and Brethren,—If this Congress were convened for no other than this, it would be a work worthy of our highest interests. I can say with all earnestness and sincerity, with all my heart, that this I believe is practically the most important meeting of the whole Congress. It is not for me to occupy your time on the present occasion with a long address, but I do most earnestly implore every one here present in this large meeting, to make in your hearts a solemn pledge to do everything that God may enable you to do to stay this fearful curse of intemperance which is desolating our homes. We have not met to-night to discuss the various questions as to the manner in which this is to be done, but to show that all of you, each in your own course and standing of life, may do something to help on this great cause which will be the subject of this discussion. I call you all to the rescue—to the rescue of those miserable families reduced to want and starvation by the sin of the husband, to the rescue of those miserable men who are destroying body and soul by this sin of intemperance. May God especially bless our work to-night. I now call upon the name of one well known in our temperance meetings. I call upon Sir Harcourt Johnstone to read or speak for the first twenty minutes.

PAPERS.

Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Bart., M.P.

What ought she not to be able to accomplish? Her opportunities are enormous—she is full of vital energy—her aggregate wealth is considerable—her ministers are zealous and learned—her laymen ready and anxious to help, and she has a *locus standi* in every parish in the country—and yet the question, "what can she do to counteract drunkenness," almost suggests she has not done all she could. What is this drunkard for whom we all feel so deeply?—he is not always a brutal sensualist, often a very pleasant fellow when sober,—a good workman, an acute, active, intelligent man with strong social instinct, but little self-control: he likes society, to hear others or perhaps himself talk, is a humourist or politician, or perhaps both. The nature of his trade is often depressing, his surroundings are cheerless, his home unhappy, his wife slovenly or perhaps herself a drunkard,—or again, he may have inherited in the blood the fatal disposition to drink—alas, too common, and so he finds

the sanded floor of the taproom of the Red Lion more pleasant and fascinating;—for it is warm and snug and bright, and his home is none of these; not so sweet as the stables our horses live in, but dirty, dull, squalid. Can we doubt that the predisposing cause of drunkenness is the bad house or the bad cottage? They are not so common as they used to be, I admit, but there are plenty of the sort I describe in town and country alike. But when the interests of the workman or labourer is limited to the four walls wherein he lives, he is not half the man he might be. If he has good water and a good garden, he has not the excuse of going to the public-house for occupation or refreshment, and that rood of land is of incalculable value to his children. It teaches them early in life to learn the rudiments of their own business at their own door, and gives them additional interest because they are working for themselves and their parents.

I speak now especially of the agricultural labourer, but even in the neighbourhood of large towns, I believe much good could be done by allotments of land. Men will walk cheerfully to till a piece of ground at some distance from their homes. I speak from experience, for it has lately been done by the Corporation of Scarborough, and it is a constant pleasure to see the land worked by manual labour, yielding health, pleasure, and profit together. This is one of the antidotes. Churchmen who are landowners, and corporate bodies and glebe-holders, may safely try the experiment where they have not already done so.

I pass from land to water. There is enough rainfall in even the driest part of these isles to supply families with water from the roof of their own house, and the addition of a tank cemented and bricked with a small pump to every slated or tiled cottage is of the utmost importance; 2½d. a week increased rent will pay a landowner 5 per cent on his outlay on each cottage for a tank of this description. There is no money so well or so wisely spent as in supplying water either from springs or tanks—none for which the labouring class are so grateful.

But we will suppose land and water properly supplied. What next? The winter nights are drawing on, the crops are housed, and where is my sociable friend, who does not wish to be a drunkard, to go to if he requires any social intercourse with his fellow-men—I mean especially the young men before they are settled in life—nowhere but to the public-house? Where do you and I go to sometimes in the dreary, foggy days of London February or November? Why, to our club, not to drink but to see our friends, hear the news, or read a magazine or review which we do not take in at home. Human nature is the same all the world over. In the last century those roystering blades, the Mohawks, who went to Ranelagh after dining, afterwards supped at the tavern, knocked down the watchmen, upset sedan chairs, put out the torches, and ended by fighting a duel in Hyde Park to vindicate their honour and reputation, were but the prototypes of the less-educated ruffian of these days, who drinks a gallon of gin and beer at his palace, kicks his wife downstairs on his return home, and goes to penal servitude or the gallows; but let that man have a chance of going to a club which is for his own benefit, and not for the publican, such clubs as 100,000 men in this country, I rejoice to say, have already got, and he will not disgrace *himself* any more than the most eminent divine present this evening disgraces himself at the Athenæum

or Oxford and Cambridge Club, when he goes to town for the May meetings. I know what good has been done by these clubs, how the moral tone of the members has been raised, how self-respect and respect for others have been engendered by the healthy check of public opinion, and the feeling of a co-operative interest in the concern, which is entirely absent in the dram shops. See how they work out their own amusements, their athletic sports, their cricket matches, their lectures, their libraries, their rooms for discussion (in the higher type of clubs). How they solve the problem of beer and no beer by settling the question for themselves, and when they determine to have it sold on the premises, how seldom it is abused.

This is another of my antidotes which all Churchmen can safely offer to the rival and more debasing attractions elsewhere.

Last year a few of us, and notably Lord Shaftesbury and my friend Alexander Brown, M.P. for Wenlock, set on foot some cafés in the east end of London. The demand for what we sell there is so large that it can scarcely be satisfied—everything is excellent of its sort, and will continue to be so. It is uphill work, for there are swarms of dramshops all around to compete with us, and these are only the first of many more that will shortly be established. The Church Temperance Association has also got its temperance cart on its wheels, and in my own neighbourhood a hardheaded Quaker has established a coffee cart in connection with an adult school to which he has devoted himself, and it has been a great success during this summer among the thousands of tourists who frequent Scarborough. I hear the same at Hull where another member of the Society of Friends has set up a Temperance Society Coffee Cart Company, and the success has far exceeded their most sanguine expectations. The shares are two shillings and sixpence each, so as to establish the co-operation of the many.

The Duke of Westminster is about to try an experiment to convert a gin palace, the lease of which is expiring shortly, in Oxford Street, into a house where every sort of refreshment is to be sold, but no spirits, only beer, and the manager is to have no interest except in things other than beer. This is the principle of the Gothenberg system, so strongly advocated by my friend Mr Carnegie;—and we shall watch its progress with great interest. The vicar of the parish St Mark's, Grosvenor Square, has there enlisted the principal employers of labour both in his "St Mark's Working Men's Club" and in the success of this novel undertaking, and they are giving him hearty support.

But in view of our national vice of drunkenness with which all these counter attractions can only cope by slow degrees, we must endeavour to adapt our own institutions, our own local government to our local necessities and desires.

Our great central power has failed hitherto,—what has not been done in Westminster may be done by people themselves in the neighbourhood of their own homes,—the problems which statesmen cannot solve must be solved by the people. If they can manage to light and drain and water their cities, and educate their children, and relieve their poor, they are fit to be trusted with the discretion of determining who shall manage their licensed victualling, and electing their Licensing Board. They will make mistakes as we all do, but they will succeed at last. I believe that regulation, not prohibition, will be the probable result.

It is not the view to elicit enthusiasm, but it is a course that I honestly think will recommend itself to the calm consideration of the people of this country, and in this matter I wait to see the Church of England lead the people. But for the moment let all Churchmen join some Temperance Association. We are not all Teetotallers nor Good Templars, but who can tell what good they have done, though we may not approve their ritual and religious views? Let every man be persuaded in his own mind. We cannot be wrong in fighting together for the sake of our country, the peace and quiet of our homes, for the morality, the sobriety, the thrift, self-denial and godliness which are daily imperilled by intemperance. It is alike our bounden duty, as well as our obvious interest, to elevate the masses of our countrymen, whether by precept or example or by such counteracting influences such as I have described, by the improvement of their dwellings and the sanitary conditions of their daily life, by guiding their social interests and desires into healthier channels of enjoyment, and by affording them every opportunity for rational recreation.

Peer and Bishop, manufacturer and artisan, parson, squire, and labourer —we have been slaves long enough, let us free ourselves.

The President.

Dear Friends,—The sight of such a meeting as this reminds me of one dear friend, now taken from us, who I am sure would have been delighted to have been present —I mean the late Bishop Wilberforce. You all know the deep interest he took in this matter, and how he would have stirred our hearts and souls with words of more than eloquence breathed with spirit and zeal. It is then with great pleasure that I introduce to you two of his sons, both total abstainers, and who will address you with a power which will leave nothing to be desired.

The Rev. Basil Wilberforce, M. A., Rector of St Mary's, Southampton.

When one of the greatest of living statesmen, speaking not long since of the intemperance of England, uttered these words, "If this great evil is to be dealt with, and the question settled, it is no use for you to look to the world or to the Legislature, you must ask the Christian Church to take it up," he spoke words, which not only exhibit a thorough realisation of the true mission of the Church on earth, but which are calculated also to awaken Churchmen to a sense of their responsibility. It can be hardly necessary in an assembly of this nature to occupy time by insisting upon the terrible prevalence of what may fairly be termed England's national sin. It is not unfrequently cast in the teeth of the advocates of the temperance movement, that they exaggerate the evils they deplore, that the pictures they draw are too highly coloured, that the cry which they raise is the utterance of meddlesome fanatics possessed by one idea, who in season and out of season force this one idea upon an unwilling world, with an utter disregard of both criticism and logic; but without denying for a moment that the temperance movement, like every other great movement for the moral and social improvement of the human race,

has suffered from the ill-judged efforts of unwise advocates, I would contend that the evil of intemperance has assumed proportions so alarming, that it becomes no longer possible to exaggerate them. "Drunkenness is at length understood," writes the *Times* in a leading article, "to be as systematic a curse to the nation as any of the diseases whose ravages are weekly recorded by the Registrar-General." And similar evidence pours in upon us from every side—from Parliamentary committees, Convocation reports, the public utterances of judges, recorders, coroners, magistrates, governors, and chaplains of gaols and workhouses, comes the unvarying testimony, beyond all power of contradiction, that a vast proportion of the crime, pauperism, lunacy of this country is attributable to intemperance alone. I do not wish to occupy time with statistics—they are within the reach of all—but, when we consider that annually* from 140 to 150 millions of money is diverted from channels of usefulness and wasted in intoxicating drinks—a sum sixty millions in excess of the national revenue, and one-sixth of the National Debt; when we spend in two days in intoxicating drinks as much as we contribute in a whole year to every missionary society in Great Britain; when the loss of life directly or indirectly attributable to intemperance has been computed at 60,000 souls annually; and when we add our own experience of the individual misery, the desolated homes, the broken hearts, the social demoralisation arising from the same source, it seems to me that every Christian must be constrained to recognise intemperance as the foremost evil of the age, and to acknowledge the truth of the telling words of a leading temperance reformer, "Strong drink is not only the devil's way to man but man's way to the devil."

And this being acknowledged, the question before us to-day is, how is this monster evil, which dishonours God and destroys immortal souls, to be met? Is the Christian Church to sit with folded arms and make no special efforts to stay the evil? Is she to rest satisfied with the tardy, piecemeal, ineffectual efforts of successive Governments, who dare not legislate in opposition to the most powerful vested interest in the country? Is she to wait till the world shows her the way, or till the struggles for self-protection, emanating from the more thoughtful of the working classes, shame her into action? Surely for the honour of the God we serve, it must not be so. The ancient saying, "*Fas est ab hoste doceri*," never met with a better illustration than in the oft-quoted words of Mr Charles Buxton, M.P., "The struggle of the school, the library, and the Church," he says, "all united against the beer-house and the gin-palace, is but one development of the war between Heaven and Hell;" and is not the war between Heaven and Hell the Church's war and not the world's war? Is it not the peculiar duty of the Church to be foremost in the battle, against whatever special development of sin may abound in each successive generation? And, again, it is the privilege of the Church alone to deal effectually and completely with the cankering sores of human nature—for she alone bears the commission, and carries the flag of Him Who knew what was in man, Who, as God and man, can deal with the corruptions and weaknesses of human nature with a human sympathy, and from a human standpoint. It is true that an increasing civilisation, a more liberal education, added

* The exact statistics are as follows:—1869, £91,000,000; 1872, £131,000,000; 1873, £146,000,000; 1874, £150,000,000.

to the utilitarian tendencies of our age, can do much—and ought to do much—towards stamping out the lower forms of sin and sensuality which degrade the human race; but they are not able—nay, it is beyond their province—to probe to the root of evil. Just as the inhabitants of some Alpine valley can confine within its channel and guide the course of the torrent, which the summer melting of the eternal ice pours through their midst, but are powerless over the mighty glacier from whence the torrent issues; so can philanthropists and statesmen and men of science ameliorate and check the course of the torrent of intemperance, whilst not touching in any way the real mainspring of the evil: while it is the peculiar duty of the Church to deal with the fountain-head of the torrent—namely, the natural impurity of the human heart. And observe, I am not here speaking of the Church in the widest and most comprehensive signification of the term—of the thousands who belong to the spirit if not to the body of the Church Catholic, but I speak of that reformed branch of the Catholic Church at present by law established as the National Church. In answering the question, "What can the Church of England do to counteract drunkenness?" I am convinced that I am by no means over-stating the case when I reply that, if the learning, the zeal, the elaborate organisation, and admirable machinery of the National Church could once be fairly brought to bear upon the intemperance of England, the battle would be well-nigh won; the temperance movement would be purified from many of the extravagances which at present clog its action; the Church herself would be marvellously strengthened, and her hold upon the affections of the people of England established against all political or theological adversaries. For the Church of England has in her parochial system a machinery capable of penetrating and leavening society through and through from the throne to the cottage; it cannot be too often insisted upon that our ministry is no mere preaching ministry; the theory of our Church is, that for our people and amongst our people we shall labour, identified with their social life, sharing their joys or bearing their burdens, watching over their spiritual growth, influencing their lives, fortifying them against sin, deepening holy principles, going with them even to the brink of death, and then, after a short separation, meeting them again and presenting them as our joy and our crown before the Saviour's throne. It is impossible to conceive a machinery more admirably adapted for storming the very stronghold of a national vice than this which stretches its roots deep into the heart of society, and provides a guardian for the souls of men at every turn and opportunity of their lives.

And now let us consider how this machinery may be utilised, and by what special efforts the Church of England can redeem the lethargy of the past and take her proper place in the battle against intemperance. First, undoubtedly, by establishing in every diocese throughout the length and breadth of the land a well-organised diocesan temperance society with the Bishop of the diocese as president, for the purpose of offering a definite resistance to the sin of intemperance. This should be affiliated to the Church of England Temperance Society, of which her Majesty has recently consented to become patron. In connection with this diocesan society there should be in every parish a parochial association, with the clergy of the parish as its presidents and vice-presidents. And this should be considered by the incumbent to be as much a definite portion of his parochial

work as his Sunday-schools or classes for instruction. The operation of this parochial society should be directed towards reclaiming the fallen, strengthening and encouraging the weak, educating public opinion, and leavening the young with principles which may enable them to resist the ravages of this vice, which will probably be their first and greatest stumbling-block in life. Time will not suffer me to enter in detail into the machinery of such a society. Abundant information will be supplied to inquirers by the secretary of the parent society upon application at the office, No. 6 Adam Street, Adelphi; but it should contain both those pledged to total abstinence and those who, with a view of assisting its operations, undertake an obligation of especial strictness in the use of alcoholic beverages. And this brings at once before us that element in the Temperance movement which experience has demonstrated to be the real crux of the matter.

It is a fact beyond all dispute that to the confirmed drunkard the only moderation consists in total abstinence; it is as total abstainers alone that such should be admitted into the parochial society. Now, in order to shield, aid, and encourage these weaker ones, whose souls we are labouring for Christ's sake to save, there is need for others, to whom, perhaps, alcoholic beverages have never been a snare, to come forward in the true spirit of self-sacrifice, and become total abstainers also. And if this blessed work is to be done, and done avowedly as an act of self-sacrifice for another's soul, I confess I do not see how the clergyman can consistently say to another, "Do thou lead and I will follow." Now, it is of course utterly impossible, in the brief limits assigned to these papers, to put the question of total abstinence from intoxicants upon its defence against all its enemies. This has been done, and it has been well done, again and again. I would recommend the perusal of an admirable pamphlet, entitled "Your Country's and your Saviour's Call," by the the Rev. Stenton Eardley, and "Christendom and the Drink Curse," an able and exhaustive volume by the Rev. Dawson Burns. In these works, and in others of a similar nature, every reasonable objection, whether moral, physical, social, or religious, meets with its complete and effectual reply. But I cannot but feel that the most satisfactory reply of all is contained in the principle, "*Solvitur ambulando.*" Let any earnest clergyman, on starting his Temperance Society, give total abstinence an honest trial, and I venture to prophesy that the difficulties will melt away, and he will experience such an increase of influence and power—yes, and clearness of brain and increased capacity for work—as will repay him a thousand-fold for any temporary self-denial. God forbid that I should condemn, in the smallest particular, those who do not see this question as we see it, and who use their Christian liberty in partaking of alcoholics as a beverage; neither, on the other hand, am I so sanguine that there floats before my mind's eye a Utopian dream of a bench of English Bishops, moving in the highest society, followed by 20,000 English clergy, abstaining totally from that which is destroying the bodies and souls of their flocks (though such a noble protest against the drinking habits of the country, made under the impulse of the love of Christ, would simply cut the gordian knot, and effectually answer the question before us to-day); but actuated by the desire that others may share in the inexpressible blessing which I

have experienced personally, I would plead with my brethren in the ministry to face this matter out for themselves.

Does the question of health keep them on the threshold of total abstinence? I would say, let them resolutely refuse to be biassed by ancient prejudice, however deeply rooted and time-honoured, and let them listen to the clear voice of modern science as contained in the "Cantor Lectures" of Dr Richardson; let them study the statistics of the Great Temperance Insurance Company, which prove that the life of the total abstainer averages several years in excess of the life of the moderate drinker; let them inquire at Portland prison whether the sudden cessation of the use of alcohol ever injured any prisoner of whatever sex, age, or condition, and they will be convinced that they will be gainers and not losers by the change. Do they conscientiously fear that by abstaining from alcohol they will be despising one of the "good creatures" of God and approaching the heresy of Manichæism? Surely St Clement of Alexandria was no prophet of Manichæism when he boldly said in the Pædagogue—"I admire those who avoid wine as they would fire; young men and maidens should totally abstain from this medicament." St Chrysostom was no upholder of the doctrine that matter is necessarily evil when he said—"Wine even when it does not produce drunkenness destroys the energies and relaxes the faculties of the soul." St Jerome could be suspected of no heresy when he wrote—"Whatever inebriates and throws the mind off the balance fly as if it were wine which is suspected to contain poison." Is the supposed sanction of Holy Scripture to the moderate use of wine a stumbling-block in the way of total abstinence? I would say that, putting entirely on one side the "Yayin" and "Tirosh" controversy, which in my opinion is calculated rather to hinder than to profit the Temperance movement, whatever argument can be drawn from the Holy Bible in favour of the use of intoxicants as a beverage, applies with tenfold force to the use of slavery as an institution; for this custom, which the Christian spirit of the age has cast with loathing from its bosom, was practised by the holiest children of God under the direct sanction of the Almighty, was never condemned by our Lord, and even after the descent of the Holy Ghost was not swept away, but made the subject of regulation by the Apostle St Paul.

But, whether the clergyman of the parish becomes a total abstainer or no, I would say by all means let the Church of England Temperance Society be planted in every parish in the land. The peculiarity of this society, and the special point wherein it differs from all other societies hitherto established to counteract drunkenness, is the broad and liberal basis upon which it is founded. Its object is to enlist all earnest members of the Church in one united effort for the repression of intemperance, and by embracing both abstainers and non-abstainers it provides work for every one.

Let it be granted that it is a noble thing to be able to say to the drunkard, "The salvation of your soul demands that the intoxicating cup should be put from you entirely, and constrained by the love of souls we have renounced it for your sake." Still there remains a vast work for those also who enter the battle from the standpoint of what is called "moderation." Such is the prejudice still existing in some quarters against total abstinence, that it is possible that moderate users of alcoholics

may be more listened to in the world, in society, in the Legislature, than those whose conscience has led them to become total abstainers. It will not be possible here to enumerate all the ways in which members of the Church who do not totally abstain may still impart a wonderful impetus to the Temperance movement: I would venture to urge most strongly upon all moderate drinkers the perusal of an able pamphlet by the Rev. Canon Hopkins, entitled "The Duty of Non-Abstainers with reference to the Temperance Cause;" but chiefly they may help by keeping the subject constantly before the minds of men, by disturbing the too common apathy with regard to this question, which in Christians is little short of criminal; by stirring up the moral sense of Christian society to take a higher, purer line with regard to this sin, which defiles the temple of the Holy Ghost and dishonours the Redeemer of mankind; by striving to leaven the society in which they move, never suffering the sin of drunkenness to be smiled away as a natural and pardonable weakness easily condoned by society; by endeavouring to dissociate in every possible way the social amenities of daily life from the use of intoxicating drinks, and in their respective parishes labouring constantly in the direction of prevention as well as cure; gathering the children into Bands of Hope; providing recreation rooms for the working classes which shall vie in attraction with the liquor shops; using their influence in discouraging the fatal custom of paying wages and holding meetings of benefit societies in public-houses, labouring heart and soul with the clergyman in the really arduous work of keeping the fortnightly meetings of the Temperance Society up to the standard in interest and amusement; constantly agitating in the direction of endowing the people of each parish or township with the power to veto the issue of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors; and, above all, by earnestly realising themselves, and teaching others to realise, that the Temperance movement is no mere utilitarian protest against certain habits of society which are retarding civilisation and threatening the national prosperity, but a terrible battle hand to hand with the mighty powers of evil, with the fiery weapons of hell itself, calling for constant, earnest prayer, that the grace of the Holy Spirit may be outpoured upon the true soldier of the cross. Truly, in the Temperance movement, "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world."

It has been impossible to condense into my allotted twenty minutes one-twentieth of the points upon which I should have wished to dwell; and I will only add that I would speak with humility but with the deepest gratitude to Almighty God of the abundant reward which, even in this world, attends an earnest plunge into this battle.

How new and unhoped-for avenues of usefulness are opened, how hundreds of hearts formerly sealed to the voice of the ministry are unlocked, how the parochial Temperance Society becomes the nucleus of adult confirmation classes, prayer-meetings, and Bible-classes, and indeed the backbone of parochial work; these are but some of the experiences which will come to bless and cheer the hearts of those who, regardless of their own comfort, inclination, or preconceived opinions, have boldly drawn the sword and rushed to the front, and thus afforded the most practical of all replies to the question at the head of this paper, by showing in their own persons "What the Church can do to counteract drunkenness."

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P.

My Lord Bishop,—I must apologise to this great meeting for not acting exactly in accordance with the programme, for I am put down in the programme to read a paper, and I do not intend to read, but I intend to speak, because I am only a humble member of the House of Commons, and I have got into the bad practice of that place, for there we are not allowed to read our speeches but have to speak them. I feel it to be a great privilege to be allowed to address you in this Hall. The President in his opening address said the object of this Congress was to search after truth, and that is the worthiest object a mortal man can aspire to; and we only want the truth to be discussed, and it will in the long-run make its way. Another reason why I feel it to be a privilege to address you is, because his Lordship stated that we might discuss a number of matters as long as we liked with great freedom, because there was to be no division. Now in the House of Commons, when I bring forward my crotchets, there is a division, and it generally goes against me, but to-night I shall go home convinced that if there had been a division, I should have had an immense majority (great laughter and cheers). I know perfectly well, my Lord, that I have not had the honour to be asked to address this meeting, because I am more anxious than any one else to suppress drunkenness; and I do not wish to dictate, dogmatise, or denounce any one. I know I am here because I have suggested a certain scheme which will, I believe, meet the question of intemperance; and you want to know what I have to say in its favour. The question put down on the paper is, "What can the Church do to counteract drunkenness?" Well, in my humble opinion, if any policy or any mode of legislation can be suggested as likely to check drunkenness, it is your duty as Churchmen and as citizens to support it. I have to deal with the legislative aspect of the question, and I will tell you what is the present state of legislation in the matter of the drink traffic. It may surprise you, but our legislation on this question is prohibition. Who of you would dare to sell in the streets a glass of intoxicating drink? for if you did you would very soon be taken up by the police, and heavily fined. Why, then, has the law prohibited the people generally from carrying on this traffic? I find a passage written by Lord Macaulay which explains this point. I was reading his speeches the other day, and I came to this passage. He was alluding to the putting down of lotteries, and he says, "It is a question of morality. We prohibit you from disposing of your property in this particular way, because it is a mode which tends to encourage a most pernicious habit of mind; a habit of mind incompatible with all the qualities on which the wellbeing of individuals and of nations depends." And it is because the drink traffic is incompatible with all the qualities on which the wellbeing of individuals and of nations depends, that our laws have wisely, on the whole, prohibited the liquor traffic. But I must explain there are a great many exceptions to the law, and there are about 150,000 persons who have a privilege which their neighbours have not. These people are brewers, the licensed victuallers, the beer-sellers, the gin-sellers,—that noble army who have so much influence at present with the Government—and these people have got this privilege. How do they get it? Why, they go to the magistrates, and if the magistrates think the people are fit and the houses suitable, and they think the neighbourhood will be the better for the gin-shops, they grant them a license to sell the thing which you and I and other respectable people are prohibited from selling. Let me assure Sir Harcourt Johnstone that I do not propose an heroic measure. It is anything but an heroic measure. I never brought in an heroic measure into the House of Commons. My bill is far too simple for Sir Harcourt

Johnstone. It does not go far enough for him, and I cannot get him to vote for it. Now what is this miserable bill of mine which you have heard abused day and night for ten years? It is simply this—that when these magistrates go to license a house, they shall not be allowed to do so if the inhabitants say, We think our religion, order, prosperity, and morality will be much improved without the house. That is the whole of that "violent and comprehensive measure" which I have repeatedly brought forward. Violent!—why, I am not so violent, my Lord, as you are. I have read your speeches with great delight, for you have spoken most boldly in the cause. In a speech you delivered at Manchester, you say you would gladly turn all the taps of the liquor-shops in Manchester, and let the liquor run down the streets. Now I never made such a violent proposition as that; for what I propose is, that if there be a village, a parish, or a little town anywhere—I am afraid there are few places of that sort—where, if the people think that a drink-shop is not desirable, they shall have the power, not to turn the taps, and let the liquor into the streets, but to prevent the publicans from turning the taps, and to shut up the shop. Now do you understand my plan? If anybody does not understand, let him hold up his hand, and I will go over it again. Well, you all understand; but when you go home, you will be full of objections, so let me deal with a few of them now. Some of you clergymen perhaps think it is a radical measure. Not at all—it is a conservative measure; for I only wish to give the people the power to conserve the morality, order, and religion of their own district; and if that is radical, it is also the noblest and truest conservatism. I would give the people no power to license. Sir Harcourt Johnstone is, I think, rather inclined the other way. He is an extreme man. He wants to go too fast. I propose to give no power of licensing, for I would not touch a license with a pair of tongs. I leave that to the magistrates or any licensing body Sir Harcourt likes. All I say is, that I would give the power to the people to veto licensing. I would give them no power to do wrong, but only power to do right. I am told my scheme will not work—that does not alarm me. I know those who know it will work—the publicans; and if they did not know that perfectly well, they would not oppose it so violently. But if it does not work, what harm is done? You are only exactly where you were before. My reason for my bill is, that the license shall not be granted for the good of the men who sell the liquor, but only for the good of the people who wish to drink the drinks. I would give no power to the magistrates or any licensing body to force drink-shops on a community which would rather be without them. I hope you will not think me a bigot, for I put in my bill a clause that a majority of two-thirds of the inhabitants of a place shall be requisite to veto the sale of drink in that particular place. That is only a detail; all I want is the principle. Well, I mean to stick to my bill as long as my constituents stick to me. I mean to support Sir Harcourt Johnstone, to do anything to diminish the sale of drink; for I oppose nobody, but I help everybody, and I wish he would help me as I help him. I tell you that in Ireland, America, or England, or wherever this principle has been carried out, the result has been all you can wish. I cannot refrain from quoting the words of our President once more. He alluded in that speech I have mentioned to the State of Maine. If you read the newspapers, you will find a paragraph about once a week, that some one has been to Maine, and gone down a cellar, and got a glass of beer after great difficulty, and he comes back and says the Maine Law is a failure. His Lordship, however, says, "Having just lately come from several months' travel through the State of Maine, I must say the appearances there are very much in favour of the Maine Liquor Law. There was no such temptation there as that exposed to the people of England, where a man, if he was of weak mind, and

weak resolution, could go into one public-house after another, spending sixpence here, and a shilling there, and two shillings in another, until he went out of the last one, either to sleep in a kennel or die in a ditch." Surely this is an improvement compared with what we have in our towns here, where a poor man cannot go a dozen yards without finding a place of temptation to drunkenness, misery, and crime. This evil is enormous, and must be dealt with sooner or later by the Legislature. We are told that this is a question to be met by the clergy. No man honours the clergy more than I do, but I do not see how the clergy are to be worked harder than they now are. If they work hard, the publican works harder, and beats them. What I want is to give the clergy a chance, and to let them have good ground to sow seed on, instead of degraded drunkards. As it is, the clergy have no chance against the publicans. We find at every meeting to promote social improvement some good clergyman saying that he wants to counteract the attractions of the public-house. Sir Harcourt told us of a benevolent association in London, who were trying to found working-men's clubs for the same purpose; but I think he complained of what uphill work it was, being surrounded by public-houses on every side. God speed the counter-attractions, but let us do away with the attractions. Do not let us go on any longer with this Penelope's web sort of work, doing with one hand what is pulled to pieces with the other. I hear that fatal bell, so I can only say a few words more. I should welcome any improvement of the Permissive Bill which may be suggested to me, and will support any one who endeavours to diminish the temptations to intemperance which abound. There is one other word I would say. It cannot be right to sow the seeds of crime and misery to enrich the revenue or the liquor-sellers, and surely I shall not appeal in vain to you, the members of the National Church. Day by day in her services you use that best of all prayers, in which we ask that we be not led into temptation. There is something selfish, I think, in praying that prayer for ourselves, and then spreading temptation in the way of others. I feel confident that if you look into this matter you will agree with me that it is not only in accordance with the principles of common sense and good government, but in accordance with the teaching of that religion which you profess, to do all in your power to remove from the path of your weaker brethren, those snares which every day are leading thousands to degradation, death, and destruction.

ADDRESS.

Mr Mark Knowles.

In answering the question, "What can the Church do to counteract drunkenness?" I wish to call your attention to the victims of drink in this country; and I have here statistics which, not to weary you, however, I will only allude to in the aggregate, showing that last year from one-fifth to one-sixth of the entire population of this country exceeded what may be termed the bounds of moderation; and I know that to you, who have never asked the question, "How many people die of drink?" the actual facts will be astounding; for it is admitted on all hands that 60,000 persons die annually, directly or indirectly, from its effects; and I think that you will agree with me that the result of an investigation which proves that there are no less than six millions of people who drink to excess, who form the rank and file from which the sixty thousand yearly victims are taken, although deeply to be regretted, seems a reasonable conclusion. Now what really has the Church done to counteract this

onslaught? Have we as Churchmen recognised our duty? are we doing it now, and shall we do it in the future? Of the 176,000 persons engaged in the trade, at least two-thirds profess to be members of the Church, and I think the personal influence of the clergy ought to be brought to bear on those persons. I wish to call special attention to this point; for while we look at public-houses as pests, yet we never put out our hands against them, because the fact of the extent of our responsibility is not recognised. And what has the Church got by tampering with this question? It may be said that the publican is a good parishioner—he attends church regularly, and pays his subscriptions punctually—supports the schools and charities in connection with the Church. That may be; but I venture to say all money obtained from this source is a dead-weight on the church-work of the parish. I am not one of those who think publicans and beer-sellers sinners above all men; there are publicans and beer-sellers, good and bad; the clergyman cannot always distinguish between the two, but would not be far wrong if he considered every public-house and beer-house as a school in antagonism to the temperance and religious work of his parish. There are 176,000 of such schools, with heads of departments, deeply interested in the liquor traffic, directing the conflict on the part of drink, and there are only 23,000 clergymen directing the movement on the part of pure religion. The odds are certainly in favour of the drink traffic, but the Church must therefore all the more earnestly declare against it. When we come to look at it from another standpoint, the need of determined action is even more apparent. Only the other day the new Member for Blackburn said, "He knew a certain indicator of the prosperity and success of the town and trade of Blackburn, and that was his mash-tub." Was it not a disgrace to the country that the prosperity of any town in it should be measured by the amount of drink consumed, more correctly than by the growth of the religious, spiritual, and moral life of its people? We must ask ourselves, How is it that it can be said that a brewer's mash-tub is the best indicator of the prosperity of a people? It is because the practice of drinking in public-houses for the mere sake of drinking is one of our customs, looked upon as social and respectable. The clergy in their sermons must be more outspoken; the trafficker in drink, no matter by whatever name described, must not be allowed to rest in a fancied security of having done his duty when he has given a liberal subscription: he must be held to his responsibility as "his brother's keeper;" he ought not to be allowed to escape when he has conducted his house in such a manner as barely to escape legal penalties. Fearlessly and openly, his duty of preventing, not intemperance alone, but excess in his house, should be declared to him; so likewise his duty to restrain bad language, but much more so the notoriously bad conduct, often knowingly allowed in these houses must be kept distinctly before the trader in drink. In fact, treat him as a fellow-man with a soul to save, in a dangerous business—a business which under most favourable management will be productive of a vast amount of crime; and never hesitate to tell such a man, God is sure to require a strict reckoning when He judges him in that court from which there is no appeal.

Then what can the Church do further? Our churches are open and so are our schools; but these men—the intemperate—cannot as a rule be touched by schools or churches, for they will not go to either. You must, then, meet them in their workshops and in their times of leisure; and unless you do this, you will do little or nothing. We are, therefore, dependent on the employers of labour for opportunities of getting at such men; and having had the opportunity myself of speaking in several of the large workshops at Hanley, I can testify to the great pleasure such an opportunity gives to the working-men. I can assure you that if employers of labour would

give half an hour or twenty minutes occasionally, so that the clergyman or some gentleman could advocate temperance to the men, they would find it would be a good investment, and pay well. Who suffers so much from the intemperance of his men as the employer of labour, and particularly when he has large contracts to fulfil? Only last week an employer told me that for the last nine months he had had one-third of his work in arrears. He said, "I don't believe in the teetotal fad, but I attribute my present difficulty to the drunkenness of my men." I said, "Why don't you give some one a chance of talking to them? We can't meet them at the public-house, and they refuse to come to school or church, and the only place to speak to them is in the workshop: why don't you give us an opportunity?" He replied, "I should gladly do it, for I have heard of the thing being done, but it has never been asked for from me before." Does this not show the Church has not done all it can in this matter? For some time past, at Derby, Manchester, and, I hear, in the Potteries also, advantage has been taken of these facilities, so that working-men could be met, and many a word has been said to them which I feel sure will ultimately be blessed. Now if employers feel inclined to give these opportunities—and I know they would if they were asked—I ask you as members of the Church to do more than you ever have done, and in every instance, if God has given you ability, show yourselves willing to use it. How many of our church-members are there in the workshops who do not try to influence their companions! How many of you have not a word to say to the man who, for want of something better, is satisfied with his dogs or his rabbit-racing. No one ever says a word to these men, or tries to make them feel the disgrace and misery they are laying up in store for themselves. Christian laymen should remember they are part and parcel of the Church's organisation. The Church does not consist of the clergy alone; working-men should try to alter the tastes of their shop-companions, discourage the singing of low, foolish songs in the workshop, and make the songs there the songs of Zion. I venture to say we have not done our duty to the working classes until we have made them take as much pleasure in singing the psalms and hymns of our Church as they have been in time past in the foolish songs learned in the pothouse. As the son of a working-man, who has been singularly blessed through religion and temperance, having been thirty-one years a teetotaller, and for above twenty years an earnest Christian worker, I know that we can stick by God in the workshop as well as in the closet. This self-sacrifice of the Christian laymen, dropping from one to another, has its influence; but in this matter we are only just beginning to realise the real usefulness of the Church's organisation. Temperance men are most anxious to help in this work, and the society I represent, with its office at 69 Corporation Street, Manchester, is determined to help anywhere in the North of England. If you will find the openings, we will find the men to say a good word for God and temperance.

DISCUSSION.

The Dean of Manchester.

I only wish to speak to you on the practical part of the work. I was present at the meeting at Manchester which has been alluded to, and there I heard the Rev. Basil Wilberforce speak, and he left on my mind a strong impression that something ought to be done. I felt it was my duty as a parish clergyman—and I speak as a parish clergyman—to see what I could do to answer the question now before us. I was told that we must begin, not with the Legislature or the diocese, but with units and in single parishes, and establish a temperance association and get up a temperance club for the comfort of

the working-men. I thought that we really must look this matter in the face; but the great difficulty is to get the total abstainers and non-abstainers to act together. We called a meeting, and we then found that the total abstainers considered that their work was so far in advance of ours that they would not work with us. I however would not accept their refusal, but I broke up the meeting; told them to go away and think the matter over, and that I would not consider this as a refusal. We met again and discussed the matter, and it seemed as if we were getting a little more nearly together. The scruples of the total abstainers were at last overcome, and we have founded a temperance society on the broad basis laid down by the Church of England Temperance Association, and we are joined together, abstainers and non-abstainers, in one common crusade against drunkenness.

Last Friday, I am thankful to say, we enrolled 250 members to begin with. Of course this number includes many of those people who are working with the clergy in church and parish—the clergy, the churchwardens, many of the Sunday-school teachers and scholars, of our district visitors, of the members of our Young Men's Association. These all resolved to become members. We mean our society for a place of refuge for those who are without such help—for a place of rallying for the young, and if it is possible to reclaim any one by private solicitation, to have a society to bring him to, where he will find companions who may confirm him, where he will have society which will help him to keep from vice. We have also a working-man's club. We have just started it, and the men are to maintain it themselves; we give them a house and furniture; we are members of the club ourselves, and we mean to go and see them in a friendly way; we wish to get lecturers and singers for them, and do everything we can to keep them away from the attractions of the public-house. The club will be managed by themselves, and we, when we go, are only visitors. I do not know whether it will be successful or not yet.

I cannot but fear one very great difficulty in our dealing with drunkenness: Some men do pledge themselves very lightly and thoughtlessly; but it is something, no doubt, to get a man to see that a change is necessary; yet many of these men are not aware of the solemnity of taking a vow, and it is our duty to bring this matter before them, for I know that many habitual drunkards in our parishes are men who have taken the pledge more than once. I have shown you what can be done in one parish; I call on my friends to attempt the same, and I ask the laity present to force their clergy if necessary to do something of the same sort.

I believe in the power of worrying, and I would worry the clergy into doing what I believe is for the benefit of the people. If you are in earnest you will make others earnest too. If we can cover the country with temperance societies, we shall at least have done something to relieve ourselves from the fearful imputation that we members of the Church of England are not doing anything to stem this great and increasing evil, which is the curse of our nation.

Mr John Hawkins.

In speaking on the drink question before this great meeting, I feel I am in the presence of those who have great influence, and can do much to suppress drunkenness. I speak, then, to them as a working-man after twenty years' experience as a total abstainer. When I look to the commencement of that time, I see the destruction that drink has brought to a great number of my fellow-working men; while some few have been rescued from intemperance by teetotalism, a great many are still addicted to intemperance, and many others have been swept away with little or no hope into eternity. I ask you, then, to use your influence and do something to remove this terrible curse from amongst us. After many trials of total abstinence, I can speak with great confidence, and I tell working-men that I am a better man in every respect for abstinence, better in health, better in position, and better in pocket too; yet there are

working-men who say they cannot do without drink. I should like them to try. For my own part, I can do my labour better without drink, and I know many other total abstainers who can do the same—steady, sober working-men, an ornament to the Church to which they belong. Things have changed very much of late years; for, twenty years ago, I stood alone almost as a teetotal Churchman in the parish in which I live. But the Church has now awakened. There are, however, some clergymen who are still silent. But surely the clergy ought to say to drunkards that they themselves have given up drinking, so that the poor creatures may learn from their example that it is not difficult to give it up. To whom are the poor to look for counsel and advice but the minister of the parish in which they live, and in which it may be they have fallen into sin? A good deal is said now-a-days about the working classes not coming to church. I know the attendance of working-men at church on Sunday is small—and why? Because the Saturday night's drunkenness keeps them away. They can't get up in time for church after a night's hard drinking, and so they fall away from church-going altogether. I know of my own experience that this is the case, and I am sure if this, the liquor traffic, were done away with, the working classes would be happier and better men. I want now to speak a few words to the High Church clergy. I ask you to help in the temperance cause, first, because you profess to hold your commissions from the Lord, and therefore ought to be independent of the world and all its bad customs. Secondly, because you profess to be ambassadors of Jesus Christ, and therefore ought to be, like Him, in a peculiar sense the friends of the poor; and there is no question in which the poor are so interested as the suppression of drunkenness. Thirdly, because you preach more than other clergymen the necessity of self-denial, and it is only by self-denial that this sin can be got rid of. If you—if all the clergy—would give up the use of alcohol, a severe blow would be struck at this great sin, the curse and shame of England.

Rev. Ernest R. Wilberforce, M.A., Vicar of Seaforth, Liverpool.

I SPEAK at some disadvantage, having to address you without much preparation: the secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society having, like some large spider, thrown his web round me just before the meeting, and having made me promise to answer any objections that might be made. I have heard no objections—I wish I had; for by a temperate discussion of all the sides of a great subject like this, we can alone hope to come to some right understanding upon it.

I feel it to be a great responsibility, and at the same time a great privilege, to be able to stand here and address you to-night; for when I look out upon the earnest faces I see below me, I feel persuaded that if we could all join together in one grand Church movement, we might, under God, work a thorough revolution in the country—one that should leave this nation sober, and *therefore free*.

I should like to put the question before you as I see it myself in my everyday life. I am living on the fringe of a great city almost entirely given up to the sin of drunkenness—a town where, in the year ending September 1874, 23,302 persons were arrested for drunkenness; not that these figures represent, as I can myself testify, a tithe of the real drunkenness of the place, for numbers stagger home unmolested by the police.

One of the saddest pictures of the case is that 8792 of the drunken cases were cases of women.

In one year 70 inquests were held in that town on the bodies of children who had been overlain by their drunken mothers between Saturday night and Sunday morning. Why, the very beasts of the field are free from such a vice as that.

In that town a little boy of twelve died drunk in the Northern Hospital: in that town a little girl of twelve, sent out by her parents to redeem a pair of boots from pledge, went

instead to a public-house, and was supplied with spirits, which with some little companions she drank in a back-court. Found wandering about drunk by the police, she was taken home; and when the door was opened, the mother was discovered drunk herself, with neighbours drinking with her.

In that town we have the highest death-rate in England—a death-rate which, taking 16 large towns abroad, not excluding New York and Calcutta, is rivalled alone by Berlin, exceeded alone by Madras. Granted that we have more than double the number of people living on an acre of ground in Liverpool than live on an acre of ground in London, yet will any sane man who knows anything of the question venture to deny that that death-rate is largely increased by the abuse of that strong drink which men of science now tell us is a deadly poison unless it be used in the very strictest moderation?

And that strong drink is abused in Liverpool, something like £72,000 being spent weekly in Liverpool by the working classes in public-houses and pawnshops. My Lord, let us not be deluded by the notion that the temperance movement is one coming down from the wealthy classes to the poor—that it is a movement originated by men with handles to their names, or by men in lawn sleeves, to tickle and to flatter and to patronise the working classes.

It is a movement forced upon the country by a cry from every class—a cry that is coming up from places where men and women whom we would fain believe to be Christians are living simply as animals; and by a cry that is coming from classes called upper as well: it is a cry which must be heard by every man who knows anything of the social or the religious state of the people, and it is a cry, therefore, which must deserve the sympathy of the Christian Church; therefore it is that the Church of England has taken up this matter, and her leaders must come forward boldly, and show those placed under them the way.

This is no time for holding aloof, for leaving the whole burden on the shoulders of the parochial clergy, or for letting the clergy fight single-handed in the battle. We want the help and the advice of men older, more learned, more influential—ay, it may be, less rabid than ourselves; and I am persuaded that if those who ought to lead us will but come forward, there are earnest men and earnest women who will follow us whithersoever they lead, and will thank God for such support in this time of greatest need. This is no time for controversy amongst those who will work in the cause: the enemy is full in sight; let us all keep our eyes fixed on him. So let me say a few words on that vexed question supposed by some irrevocably to keep asunder the moderate drinkers and the total abstainers. Why is the temperate man to ostracise the total abstainer? why is the total abstainer to be perpetually flinging a glass of cold water in the face of the moderate drinker? Surely in the Bible Christian liberty is laid down as the true rule, in words than which nothing can be possibly plainer—liberty to use, liberty to abstain from using if we choose, these meats or drinks, provided that, if we use them, we do so in strict moderation, and, if we abstain, we do so from a right motive.

Let us have no quarrelling as to which is the best weapon; let each man use that which he thinks the best. Let him keep it as sharp and in as good repair as possible, but do not let the temperate man use the weapon against the abstainer, and the abstainer turn his weapon against the moderate man; let the common foe be the one against whom all weapons are turned, and, with faces all set one way, let us go forward against that foe.

If we fight under one banner, we can be united; and if we are united, I do believe, under God, we may work a moral revolution in the land, and may save many a perishing soul, and wipe off the undoubted stain now resting on the Church of England for her apathy in this matter. Let us hear no more rubbish talked about Manichæism in connection with the Church of England temperance movement. Why, St Augustine himself, in his book about the Manichæans, points out that there were numbers of Christians in his day who abstained both from flesh and wine, and he mentions the fact with approval; pointing out that it was not the nature of the thing abstained from that made the action right

or wrong, but the *motive for which* a man abstained. And he shows the threefold cause of abstinence—(1.) "to check indulgence;" (2.) "to protect weakness on account of the things sacrificed and offered in libation;" (3.) which he mentions as most praiseworthy of all, from love, not to "offend the weakness of those more feeble than ourselves, who abstain from these things." Surely we can none of us escape our individual responsibility in this matter. "We, then, that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves."

Let us be deterred by no hard language, by no unkind speeches, by no bitter, scurrilous attack. These things there will be; what do they matter? Let us strengthen personal effort by banding together in one great corporate movement, knowing that we are living for the future, that in us the future life is already begun; that, as members of the one body of Christ, the life of each affects the well-being of the whole; and that, mysterious though it be, our actions now reach through others even to Christ Himself. "For inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me."

The Rev. Prebendary Harland.

My Lord Bishop,—I have not asked permission to address the Congress with the intention of making a speech, but only for the purpose of reading a note which I have received from Major Fulford, the governor of our county prison, bearing directly upon the subject now before us. Speaking to so many who are strangers to Staffordshire, I may be allowed to say, that there is not an officer in England who holds a higher position than Major Fulford as the governor of a great prison, so that anything coming from him is sure to command respect. A few days ago, I heard that he had made a statement which I thought might be very usefully laid before this Congress, and knowing that he was not likely to be here, I ventured to write to him on the subject, and yesterday received the following answer:—"Being from home, and away from my books, I cannot speak as to the committals for drunkenness absolutely to a man, but I can say that in the last quarter, out of more than 1200 prisoners committed to Stafford prison, more than 400 were for being drunk, a large number of whom had been again and again previously convicted of the same offence; and of the remainder, more than half were for offences traceable to drinking." Major Fulford afterwards speaks of the importance of raising the moral tone and improving the dwellings of the people. But these, and other like suggestions, have been already forcibly pressed upon the Congress, and at this late hour I will not repeat them. My only object in rising is to bring before you this simple fact, which speaks for itself, that of more than 1200 committals to our county prison during the last three months, more than 800 (that is more than two-thirds) have been occasioned, directly or indirectly, by drunkenness.

The Rev. W. E. Littlewood.

I shall occupy a very few moments by referring to a subject to which reference has already been made. I mean, the great encouragement those who favour the cause of temperance derive from what they observe on the other side of the Atlantic. I have recently spent my vacation, partly in the United States, and partly in Canada; and one of the reasons I had for going there was the deep interest I take in this temperance question, and my anxiety to see what was really the aspect of affairs over there. I have come back fully convinced that our cousin Jonathan is considerably ahead of John Bull in this matter. He is ahead on several points, and I will mention one or two of them.

In the first place, on the Lord's-day the liquor-shops are universally closed. Then they don't permit that abomination of the trade here, which places behind the drink-counters attractively-dressed and pretty girls. No woman in America is allowed to stand at a bar where drink is sold. Then at meals no intoxicants are put on the table; if you want them, you must ask for them. I was told that President Lincoln never put intoxicating liquor on his table during his term of office, either at his public or private banquets. And lastly, there are severe restrictive laws against the sale of drink in many districts. Sir W. Lawson's proposals are carried out because the people have the option of saying whether they will have the drink-shops or not. I attribute this to the influence of the Christian Church of America, for it is on the side of temperance, and the clergy, Sunday-school teachers, and others connected with the Church are total abstainers. Now, can we not do what the unestablished and voluntary Church of America can do? We ought to do it. I am sure that the temperance societies are longing to be supported by the Church. The Good Templars came to us the other day and asked the rector of our city for the use of the great abbey for a service. The rector granted the use of that building with pleasure. The abbey was crowded with people, many of whom were Nonconformists. The Church of England does not know its power. What are £5, given by a publican, to the millions of sixpences of the people.

The Rev. R. O. Assheton.

In the face of that clock it would be folly to waste time in apologising for coming before you, though perhaps I ought to do so, as my experiences of temperance work may seem to many to be little more than microscopic; and yet, being those of a country parson in a small place, they may not be without value. If possible, I say, take up the Church of England Temperance Association. But in small places this is not always easy; for the Nonconformists have usually produced or absorbed all the zeal of the community in this direction. In my parish I was asked by some of the dissenters to allow the school to be used for temperance meetings. I consented on two conditions—1. That I should always be in the chair; and, 2. That no party politics, religious or secular, were introduced. In this position I believe a non-abstaining clergyman may benefit both the temperance movement, and also receive benefit himself. He may benefit the temperance cause in the place notably in these three directions: —

1. By clearing the minds of total abstainers from the unfortunate notion that alcohol is in itself a cursed thing.

2. By protesting against the practice, too common on temperance platforms, of turning drunkards into joke.

3. By representing to abstainers the danger indicated in St Luke xi. 24.

The non-abstainer may also find that the abstainers, in spite of their "fanaticism," may have something to teach him. For instance, it was at such a meeting that, after explaining that the Rechabites were blessed, not for their abstinence, but for their filial obedience, I was reminded that the blessing and its fulfilment anyhow teach us that total abstinence is neither displeasing to God nor unconducive to physical health.

The Rev. Theophilus Bennett, M.A., Vicar of Eastrington, East Yorkshire.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson alluded to some of the bad practices of the House of Commons, but that assembly has one good practice, and that is, it sticks to the question before it. I rejoiced to hear the remarks of Sir Harcourt Johnstone, pointing out various preventive measures for counteracting and mitigating the evils of the drink traffic; but,

after all, Sir Harcourt's suggestions deal with only the very outward fringe of the curse of drunkenness.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson said—and the words touched a responsive string in my heart—that we, the clergy, are already overtaxed, and that in this war with the publicans we are overmatched. I agree with Sir Wilfrid that the publican is more than we can manage. He can and does beat us. In my own parish in the North, I tried every means to make headway against the publicans, but, alas! I have been invariably beaten. I tried night-schools—they beat me; penny readings—they beat me; a "British Workman"—they beat me; preaching, reading, visiting, cricket-club, everything I could think of, still invariably the same sad tale—the publicans beat me!

We clergymen have been long enough burying our heads like the ostrich in the sands, and deluding ourselves into the persuasion that we were all serene. But it is time we roused up and saw our danger, and looked it fairly in the face. We require organisation. And therefore we want the Church of England Temperance Society. We are not a match for the publicans; but what shall we do? (A voice: "Put them down.") Yes; there is one way we can help to put them down, and that is, *not* to aid them directly or indirectly in getting licences. When I was beneficed at Christ Church, Plymouth, publicans solicited me to sign their petitions, flatteringly telling me that "the signature of the clergyman of the parish counted for ten." My reply was, "I will sign for none, and then nobody can be jealous." Thus I escaped putting down my name. And if ever I sign for one of them, may my right hand forget its cunning!

It has been said that drunkards do not keep their pledges. And I myself had melancholy proof of this when incumbent of Withington, near Manchester; for, out of 187 that I got to sign the teetotal pledge, only eight remained steadfast at the end of three years from the date of signing.

I conclude by urging on my brethren the necessity of action, and I do trust they will do all they can to counteract this great evil of intemperance.

The Rev. R. M. Grier, M.A.

"What can the Church do to counteract drunkenness?" Stamp it out, if she pleases, as we stamped out the rinderpest. Now, I wish to call attention to a fact to which no allusion has been made by previous speakers. Drunkenness is not confined to the working classes. It would be a very great mistake to suppose it. There is a great deal of drunkenness in all classes of the community, and in both sexes. I do not indeed venture to speak of any woman, whether behind the bar or behind the counter—whether pretty or ugly—as an abomination, as one speaker has done; but there are in this country many ladies who ought to be models of all that is refined, who are unhappily the objects of our deepest pity. The time is now come when no man who values the honour of womanhood ought to trifle with this sin. All who have ever loved a holy mother ought to rise and say, "This sin shall no longer be found amongst us." For drunkenness is not like other sins; it is preventible; it comes from the use of an unnecessary article of diet; and the two chief sources of it are the drinking habits of the country and the present facilities for drinking. And it is to the gentry of England, members for the most part of the Church, that the estates on which these public-houses are to be found belong. I saw it stated the other day in a newspaper that amongst the largest public-house proprietors in the country are the Bishops of the Church. I am sure they are ignorant of the fact; their estates are under the management of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; but, now that their attention has been called to it, I cannot help hoping that the public-houses will be closed. Any representation made by them as a body to the Commissioners would necessarily have great weight. But the facilities for drinking are, we must remember, under the protection of the law, and for the state of the law we are all responsible. We are all

responsible for the exposure of men, whose wills have been weakened by drinking, to temptation which they cannot now resist. We are all responsible for the exposure of the young to temptation which they do not resist. We are all more or less responsible for the intemperance of the country. No doubt it would be madness to close all the public-houses in England at once by an imperial enactment; but to say that a parish shall not have the power of closing the public-houses in it, if the inhabitants desire it, seems to me to be a stupid and a cruel wrong. Sir Wilfrid Lawson is a Liberal, and I am a Conservative; but I declare that Sir Wilfrid's Permissive Bill is one of the most conservative, just, and reasonable measures ever proposed on any subject to the House of Commons. Surely it is right that the people should be able to decide for themselves whether they will have amongst them a proved source of misery and taxation and crime. I am very much afraid that this temperance movement may ere long become purely democratic. For it is not the poor who stand in the way of all temperance reform: they would be only too glad to be free from public-houses. Nor is it the drunkard who stands in the way: he would be rejoiced to be delivered from temptation which he cannot resist. It is the wealth—it is the respectability—it is the gentlemen of England who are obstructive—gentlemen who, for the most part, are members of the Church. My Lord, I have no hesitation in saying that if the Churchmen of England were to combine upon this subject, remedial measures might be carried in the House of Commons; and there is no question at present so important as that of the suppression of intemperance: the defence of the Established Church is a matter of very small consequence compared with it. The Church of England might be deprived any day of her wealth and position, which are but an accident to her, and yet be vigorous and strong; but she cannot neglect her special work—the pulling down the stronghold of Satan—without losing the favour of her Lord. I earnestly call on all Churchmen to support the only practical measure ever yet proposed in the English Parliament for the suppression of intemperance—the Permissive Prohibition Liquor Bill, advocated year after year with so much ability by Sir Wilfrid Lawson.

TUESDAY EVENING, 5th OCTOBER.

Josiah Dimmock, Esq., J.P., took the Chair, in the Town Hall, at Seven o'Clock.

CHARITY ORGANISATION, GENERAL AND PAROCHIAL: DESTITUTE CHILDREN.

The Chairman.

Charity organisation seems to suggest some such machinery as that on which I have the honour to be at the head in this town. There seems to be a little contradiction of terms in the phrase "Charity Organisation." In individual charity there are two things which should be aimed at—one is that, in relieving the destitution of the person upon whom we bestow our charity, we should not deprave or vitiate the gift by what would seem to wound, I will not say the self-love, but the self-respect of those upon whom the gift is bestowed. I will illustrate what I mean by a story. A friend of mine was informed of the case of a man who had been in a good position as an artisan, but who, through a long and lingering illness, fell into debt. My friend gave to him what would be considered a large sum, but, as regards charity, really a small one, namely,

£3; and the letter which he received acknowledging the gift made a great impression upon the mind of my friend. Whilst the poor-law provides that none shall perish from want, I think that charity can never be effectually distributed so as to reach many cases, unless by persons who have been themselves at the pains to know the wants of their neighbours, and to relieve them in a way which can scarcely, perhaps, be included in the term "Charity Organisation." Those are things which occur to me. It is not my business to take up your time—it will be much better occupied in hearing those whom I will introduce to you; and I will now call upon Mr Longley to read a paper upon this important subject.

PAPERS.

Mr H. Longley.

It will, I suppose, be generally admitted, that the movement of which associations for the organisation of charity are the visible expression, has taken its origin practically in some such state of things as this: it was obvious to the most cursory observation that while vast sums, sufficient materially to alleviate, if not to remove, the pressing needs of the poor, were bestowed in alms-giving, their general condition was not improved in a degree at all corresponding to this expenditure;—that whatever might be the amount of good actually done by almsgiving, it tended to promote fraud, and to pauperise and demoralise the recipients, and, worst of all, that it too often failed to attain its immediate object, the supply of permanent and effectual help to those most urgently and deservedly in need of it.

It was seen too that a poor law, however administered, neither could nor ought to meet all the wants of the poor, and this at a time when by a sounder administration of the law, a novel pressure had of late been applied to the charitable by the refusal of out-relief in cases in which it had previously been given almost as a matter of course.

The causes of this perversion and frustration of good instruction were not really far to seek.

Effective almsgiving consists not in mere giving but in giving wisely;—and in this is implied a knowledge, a power of research, an accumulated experience, which if attainable at all by a single giver, can be acquired only by an expenditure of time which is practically incompatible with the exigencies of individual cases of distress.

In other words, isolated almsgiving involves a waste of power which has suggested the remedy commonly resorted to in more purely mechanical spheres of work, *of division of labour*.

When it was seen that gifts were unnecessarily multiplied by independent givers, dealing unknown to each other with the same case, and that the undeserving received alms where the deserving were often refused them, it was evident that not only zeal but knowledge was needed for the work, and the knowledge, too, rather of many than of one.

The problem to be solved was, in short, how to secure for almsgiving the benefits of associated operation, while preserving for it its peculiar and essential privilege of individual and personal influence over and contact with the poor; it was necessary to systematise and organise giving, but to remember at the same time that givers are responsible beings and not machines, and to regulate and formulate the efforts of benevolence

without drying up or paralysing its vital source. At the very outset of an inquiry into the principles upon which an attempt to work out these results should proceed, we are met by the fact that the work to be done covers a larger field than that of mere voluntary almsgiving or charity, as it is popularly called, and as it will be convenient here to term it.

The existence of a poor law compels a division of relief to the poor into voluntary and involuntary, or legal relief, and it is therefore necessary, to a clear conception of the work of charity organisation, to keep distinct the main divisions of its operation, which may be thus stated in order of their natural sequence.

I. The decision of the question whether or not real need of relief exists.

II. The demarcation, where need is shown to exist, of the true sphere of charity from the province of other relief to the poor.

III. To carry out, in the proper sphere of charity, when it shall have been thus ascertained, the distribution of alms or private charity in the most fitting and appropriate manner, with a due regard to the permanent welfare, moral as well as physical, of the recipients.

On the first two of these divisions of the subject time will not allow me now to dwell at length.

I. But the imperative necessity for the most full, searching, and multiform inquiry which is suggested by the first, has already been abundantly insisted upon by many writers and speakers on this subject, and it has thus come to be generally recognised as an axiom in Christian organisation that an almost inexhaustible field of inquiry is opened up by each application for aid which presents itself. The highly interesting and concise report made to the Local Government Board by Miss Octavia Hill on the administration of charity in a district of the parish of Marylebone,* may be specially cited in illustration of this part of the subject.

II. On the second point, I will merely refer you for a lucid and authoritative definition of the provinces of legal and voluntary relief, to the now celebrated minute of the Poor Law Board, issued by Mr Goschen in November 1869, and to these weighty words of the Poor Law Commission of 1833, which have always seemed to me to contain the solution of most of the difficulties which beset this branch of the subject:—

"The bane of all pauper legislation has been the legislating for extreme cases. Every exception, every violation of the general rule to meet a real case of unusual hardship, lets in a whole class of fraudulent cases by which that rule must in time be destroyed. Where cases of real hardship occur, the remedy must be applied by individual charity, a virtue for which no system of compulsory relief can or ought to be a substitute."—*Poor Law Commission of Inquiry*, 1834, p. 263.

III. It remains then to deal with the question—which is frequently treated as co-extensive with that of the general organisation of charity—of the fit and appropriate distribution of alms. It is at this point that a system of charity organisation comes into the closest contact with the special work of existing agencies, and enters upon that part of its functions which is most delicate, and as to which some misconception has, at times, prevailed. It is, I take it, no part of the work or objects of the organi-

* Local Government Board Reports, 1874, p. 129.

sation of charity to interrupt or to arrogate to itself the work of existing agencies for relief, whether public or private. It is, on the other hand, within its sphere to assist those agencies by the promotion of the interchange of information between them, and by encouraging in every practicable mode the pursuit of the most searching inquiry into the circumstances of applicants for relief. It is necessary to bear in mind, in dealing with this part of the subject, that a system of organised charity, such as we have been considering, has its expression and embodiment in the meeting for the purposes of interchange of information and, if need be, of united action, of those who in a given locality have heretofore distributed the alms of others, or their own. The existing agencies are thus approached from within and not from without, and no step can be taken in the essential part of the work unless and until this combination of relief agencies be effected. It is true, that in large centres of population where the work is proportionately arduous, the principle of the division of labour, which has already been shown to be at the root of an organisation of charity, may suggest the exclusive employment of individual efforts, in the single work of bringing existing agencies into harmonious co-operation, and of discharging on their behalf any part of their functions of inquiry which they may be unable themselves to undertake. But it cannot, I think, be too strongly insisted upon, that charity organisation can maintain that life and vigour which are the guarantees of efficiency, only by means of the actual efforts and hearty co-operation, as distinguished from the mere sympathy and approbation of local almsgivers.

It cannot be denied that some of the most real difficulties which have beset the progress of this work have arisen from the reluctance of many of those who are charged with the distribution of the alms of others, and especially of those collected by religious bodies, to give their adhesion to a cause which appears to them to be identified with a disregard of personal and individual exertions and of moral influence in the work of almsgiving. No objection can command greater respect than this, or would deserve greater weight, were the assumption on which it proceeds well-founded. The misapprehension which has arisen on this point seems to be caused by the carrying out in practice of the principle, to which none will refuse assent, that alms should be given only as a result of inquiry. A restriction is thus imposed upon much easy and indiscriminate giving of which many have been at first impatient. It needs, however, no very profound acquaintance with the work in hand to perceive that personal work among the poor has higher functions than those of mere giving. Any system must stand at once self-condemned which should, directly or indirectly, interpose any barrier to the personal intercourse between rich and poor, which is of the highest obligation, and of which the benefits are so essentially reciprocal. But a system which, by rendering inquiry essential to giving, shall tend to separate personal intercourse between the poor and those of other classes from a *necessary* connection with the actual bestowal of alms, would seem at once to promote the best interests of both. For it must surely be that a higher form of self-restraint and self-denial is exercised by him who refrains from giving hastily on the first hearing of a tale of distress, and who laboriously seeks, first to prove its truth, and then to relieve the applicant rather in the most effectual than in the most obvious mode, THAN by him who, with whatever kindness of heart,

yields to the impulse of the moment, and gives in utter ignorance whether or not he is encouraging vice and imposture, or whether the need which he seeks to remove may not be ultimately aggravated by the gift. On the other hand, it cannot but be that where personal intercourse is dissociated from mere almsgiving the visitor, to use the words of a high authority on the subject, "appears in his true light of a sympathising and experienced friend and counsellor, without the deflecting influences which at present hang about this relation." *

The removal of such misconceptions is of the first importance, for where local distributors of alms stand aloof from the work of charity organisation, it tends irresistibly to drift into an additional agency for relief, which, though its inquiries may be diligently and wisely prosecuted, and though interchange of information may be attained by its agency, must yet fail to have the same power of adapting relief to the special need of each applicant, as would be the case if interchange of resource as well as of information were fully accessible to it.

And, assuming, as we may, that the expenditure on almsgiving is generally sufficient, if properly applied, to effect its object, the creation of a new fund for relief would seem to amount to a critical condemnation of the existing administration of charity in a locality. Indeed, the highest ideal of a system of charity organisation would seem to be fulfilled by that which shall ensure the closest and most effective co-operation of existing agencies, while leaving exclusively to them the task of providing increased funds, if any be needed.

Subject to the application of these general principles the administration of alms in the manner most appropriate to each case must be a question of detail, and can be illustrated only by special reference which cannot be made here to each of the three classes into which charity may be divided, viz. :—

(*a*) Private gifts.

(*b*) Gifts by voluntary associations, including gifts by religious bodies.

(*c*) Gifts from the funds of charitable endowments.

One practical suggestion, however, I may be allowed to make in view of the extension of the system of charitable organisation to districts where it has been hitherto unknown, which may be a possible result of this discussion. It should be remembered that charity organisation is essentially elastic in its operations,—that it adapts itself to the varying circumstances of different localities, and that its principles apply as closely to the most extensive spheres of almsgiving as to its minutest incidents.

The efforts which, on the one hand, in London and other large centres of population bring into one focus hundreds of charitable agencies, and those which on the other hand in a country parish double the resources of charity, by providing that the squire and parson shall not give port wine at the same time to the same sick man (I am putting no imaginary case),—these efforts have the same origin and the same end; they differ in degree only, not in kind. The system is of universal application, for the mischief which it seeks to remedy is nowhere absent.

A word on this last of the classes of gifts which I have just enumerated, the distributors of which have, so far as I am aware, received but little en-

* Report upon the Poor, 1872, S. P. K. p. 13.

couragement to join in the work of organised charity. I know of no reason in the nature of things which should debar those who dispense the funds of charitable endowments from the benefits which result from such a system of organisation as I have attempted to indicate. Nor, again, can it be otherwise than desirable in the best interests of those for whose benefit these funds are designed that they shall be so bestowed as to prevent imposture and mendicancy, and to promote self-reliance, thrift, and independence.

This may be said to be a homely and unheroic mode of handling so grave a question as that of the disposal of charitable endowments, but I have reason to know that it is at least a practical one. Much has been done within the last few years, and much more may be done and will be done, working within the existing limits of these endowments, to assist and encourage those who administer them to use such discrimination and discretion in the discharge of their duties, as will effectually further the work of securing appropriate relief to the needy. It is, indeed, almsgiving in the form of endowed and, therefore, permanent charity, which is chargeable with many of the evils which it is the work of an organisation of charity to remedy ; and this, not merely because of the thoughtlessness and formality with which these funds have too often been dispensed, but because the permanence of the funds, and the regularity and precision with which they are so often bestowed, tend to foster in the minds of the recipients a belief that mere right and not benevolence is the source of the gift.

It remains to touch upon one or two incidents of the general question under discussion, which do not fall strictly within any one of the main divisions of the subject which have been adopted.

A sounder administration of the poor law, and a consequent rise in the condition, social and moral, of the poor, will be found to be an indirect, but most valuable result of an organisation of charity. This is not the place for a discussion of poor law principles, and I must, therefore, ask my hearers to assume for the present purpose :—(1.) That to administer in an unduly eligible form that legal relief which the recipient may claim in some form or other as of right, will inevitably tend to educate the poor to a condition of thriftlessness and dependence :—(2.) That none but indoor relief is sufficiently ineligible and deterrent to prevent this consequence of its receipt, and :—(3.) That the rate of wages is distinctly kept below its natural level by the existence of out relief, whether given directly in aid of wages or earnings, or held out in the future as a substitute for, and so a dissuasive from, thrift and providence. If guardians were sure that where real and undeserved hardship would be occasioned to an individual by a strict adherence to the principles thus indicated, an organised system of charity would step in to rescue the case from this severe treatment, it is obvious that their hands would be greatly strengthened in resisting the pressure now put upon them (not unfairly in existing circumstances) to administer relief, not according to principle, but with reference to the merits of the applicant. Until this is the case, so long will guardians be in the false position o having to do, to some extent, the work of charity as well as their own and much mischief must result, as it has already resulted, from th confusion of two essentially distinct forms of relief.

Some stress has been already laid upon the danger which besets a system of almsgiving, of becoming "hardened and stiffened into a formal and legal system of relief." Reference has been particularly made to the effect upon the poor of such a perversion of charity. It is well, however, on the other hand, in the highest interests of the givers of charity, to guard against any tendency to substitute the impersonal and quasi-official agency of a system or an institution for personal intercourse and direct sympathy with the poor. It should be remembered that while charity is but feeble and impotent in its efforts without organisation, a mere organisation of almsgiving, if untempered by a true spirit of charity, must even more conspicuously fail to effect permanent good. The organisation of charity is, after all, merely a means to an end, and that end can be no other than the wise and considerate practice of the Christian duty of almsgiving.

So far from discouraging personal work among the poor, a system of Christian organisation calls loudly for increased personal service for the work of inspection and inquiry, as well as for that of the direct distribution of alms;—its chief aim is to guide and stimulate the work of individuals;—to supplement it, rather than to provide a substitute for it.

This view is, I find, not unfamiliar to these Congresses, and has been eloquently enforced by Dr Hannah in his address to the Bath Congress of 1873 (pp. 80, 81). He says:—"Charity must be organised, but it is still more important that its religious character shall never be forgotten. It is true that such disorganisation in plan and thoughtlessness in practice have brought unmerited reproach on the holy scriptural obligation. . . . But the duty cannot be robbed of its religious obligation by the mistakes of those who exercise it unwisely, any more than it can be talked out of existence by the theories of political economy. It is equally true, however, that it must not be discharged carelessly and thoughtlessly, nor without paying due regard to other just and righteous social duties."

These words contain, indeed, the sum of the whole discussion. They point, on the one hand, to the natural defects and the besetting sins of individual almsgiving, and, on the other, to the remedies and correctives for these which system can alone furnish. They assign to each factor in the common and united work of charity its proper sphere and value; and, lastly, they illustrate forcibly, that which it has been the purpose of this paper to vindicate, however imperfectly, the increased usefulness,—the higher dignity,—and, above all, the more mature Christian obligation of intelligent almsgiving.

The Rev. J. F. Kitto, M.A.

The mere bestowal of our money in order to clothe the naked or to feed the hungry, is but a very small part of the duty which charity demands. A wise administration and a prudent direction are essential to true charity. It is easier, no doubt, to give to the most importunate than patiently to investigate the claims of the more retiring and more deserving. And many a man will give like the unjust judge to persistent importunity, what he had denied to the simple claims of justice. Now it is obvious that charity cannot be wisely bestowed, unless it is given with a full knowledge

of the applicant and his circumstances. Hence there arises, in towns at least, where the applicant may be a comparative stranger, the necessity for investigation and inquiry more painstaking and efficient than can generally be accomplished by any individual effort. And if such inquiries into all unknown cases could be made universal or even general, two important advantages to the cause of charity would be secured.

(1.) A check would be put upon the habit which is only too easily acquired of tapping various sources of relief, and obstacles would be placed in the way of making a trade of begging.

(2.) Another advantage of no less value would be secured, if inquiries were so general and so searching, that it should come to be clearly understood that, no matter where assistance was sought or of what kind, no charitable help was to be obtained but by the deserving.

These considerations alone would show the need of system and organisation in our distribution of charitable funds. But there are other reasons which no less forcibly point to the same conclusion.

(1.) The want of organisation tends to produce waste of effort. Many persons will be doing the same work.

I know a village where no sooner does a man fall ill, than the whole benevolence of the neighbourhood seems to pounce upon him, as vultures pounce upon their prey, and with so little of real consideration that the poor patient may be overloaded with all the delicacies of the season to-day, and may be left to lack the commonest necessaries of sickness to-morrow.

But again, the want of organisation is often the cause of cases of the utmost necessity and great deserving being overlooked. In spite of all that is done in behalf of the poor, it is much of be feared, that patient and unpretending poverty, which tries to hide its need, will often pine away untended and uncared for, while barefaced hypocrisy will flourish unabashed.

There is, however, a grave danger in all such organisation, which it is well for us to face. The inevitable tendency of all such organisation is to develop a sort of formal and official charity, from which all true sympathy is excluded on the one side and all gratitude is shut out on the other. It would be a serious loss, for which no amount of perfection in the mere machinery of benevolence could compensate, if the suffering poor should be withdrawn from close and constant contact with the personal sympathy of the wealthy. What we want in the administration of charity is more of personal service and not less, and I cannot help feeling that when the element of love is wanting on one side or the other, the inevitable tendency of this so-called charity must be to pauperise and to degrade. If an applicant is to seek assistance at a regular office, is to have every detail of his past history hunted out by a paid and unsympathising official, and is then to be relieved by that official upon the decision of a committee which he has never seen, I confess I cannot see that it matters much whether the aid given comes from the poor law or from charitable funds, since the result is sure to be the same, and no feelings of affection or obligation or gratitude are awakened in the recipient. If there be need, as there most surely is, of official and formal investigation and organisation and inquiry, there is no less need for personal service and sympathy for aid to the poor and the deserving. The Church, at least, can never dare to desert the duty which she owes to her Lord, to help the poor for His

sake. The poor, we know, will never cease out of the land. We may help them, but we shall never get rid of them. It is not only the worthless and depraved but the weak and the feeble also who are borne down in the race of life by the vigorous and the strong. It is the part of Christian tenderness and love to shrink from no effort and to spare no service by which the poor may be cared for, and the lost by God's mercy be reclaimed.

And in every community there must always be certain classes to be tenderly treated with forbearance and with love. The aged, the sick, and the afflicted, are obvious instances of this. But there is no class which seems to me to call more loudly for organised effort, and for large and liberal aid, than the class of destitute children. How much depends upon their treatment! The work of the aged is over, and if you neglect them in selfish indifference, at least you don't leave them as a legacy to the future; but the life of these children is to come, and if they are neglected, what a bitter harvest must be reaped from our carelessness to their needs.

A great deal no doubt has been done within the last few years to meet the most pressing and obvious needs of this class. When we consider all the various machinery which has been supplied: the workhouse, the district schools, the reformatories and refuges and training ships and industrial schools, the orphanages, and homes of almost every kind, we cannot but be thankful for all the efforts which have been put forth in behalf of the children of the poor. And now, at last, we are even able to look forward to the time when no parent will be allowed to suffer his child to grow up utterly untaught, in entire ignorance of his duties to God and man. But even more than this seems to me to be demanded. It is surely the business of the State, merely as a matter of selfish prudence, to provide that parental duties shall not be so neglected as to cause the rising generation to be a source of danger to the whole community. If a parent neglects his child, it is the business of the State to interfere to protect and rescue the child, and to punish the parents. If a worthless parent should attempt to waste the property to which his child is entitled, or should so harshly treat it as to endanger its life, then the State will interfere; but if the parent is contented with the utter perversion of a child's moral nature, and with the absolute neglect and ruin of its spiritual interests, then we can talk of English liberty and parental responsibility, and will claim no authority to interfere. I cannot help hoping that the time is not far distant when, for all children who are destitute either from the fault or the misfortune of their parents, some provision will be made by the authority of the State, which, while it does not relieve an undeserving parent from his own personal responsibility, will not commit his helpless and innocent children to irretrievable ruin.

But quite apart from all that the State may be able to accomplish, surely the Church of Christ must recognise her duty to the destitute children who claim her care. He who calls Himself the "Father of the fatherless," commends them to our love. We must, and I think we may, take good care that our Christian zeal does not become a premium to parental indifference and neglect; but we cannot, we dare not, for Christ's sake, and for our country's sake, be content to fold our hands, and plead that it is no concern of ours, and that we have no means to remedy the evil. These destitute children, wherever they are, are helpless *from no*

fault of theirs. What wrong have they done that Christian philanthropy should consign them to ruin.

No one surely would urge that to care for them is the business of the State alone. Nay, I venture even to urge that those who are the State's peculiar charge have strong claims also upon our Christian benevolence and regard. Are all the thousands of the lambs of Christ's flock who are growing up in our workhouses and district schools, to be left out of Christian thoughtfulness and love? Are not these children dear to our Master? Is there no duty which Christian fidelity calls upon us to discharge towards them? Consider for a moment how these children are trained. Brought up in entire dependence upon those around them, simple units amongst a large number massed together, all taught, and clothed, and fed by dull routine, having nothing to call forth individual energy and thought: taking no pride in their work in which perhaps they can each have but a hundredth share; with no motive for exertion, and no stimulus to incite to well-doing; with no one to love and care for; is it any wonder that such children should grow up with an utter want of self-control and self-reliance, in apathy and idleness, in habitual deceit and overweening vanity, in listless and careless indifference to either praise or blame.

Love, patience, and gentleness, brought to bear upon each individual, may by God's blessing work great changes; but it is just this personal sympathy and individual care which no workhouse child can gain. Women of England and of England's Church, are not your hearts stirred to the depths when you think what a world of childish love and affection is being stunted, dwarfed, and crushed, so that it cannot grow up to adorn and beautify the Christian life. There are two ways in which I venture on their behalf to claim your loving help.

1. The perilous time for children thus trained is when they first leave the school to enter upon the responsibilities of life. We all know how carefully and how anxiously our own young ones would be watched at such a period; but who is there to supply to the pauper child the lack of a parent's care? Tossed out upon the wide world, for which their training has so unfitted them, with no one to watch them, no one to go to in trouble, no one to correct their mistakes, no one to sympathise in their sorrows, homeless and helpless; what wonder is it that so many drift away into a ruin from which there seems to be no rescue? Is it too much to hope that the love and energy of Christian women may stand in the breach and supply the need? Is it too much to expect that there might be produced such an amount of co-operation between the guardians of the poor and the Christian public, as would secure for every child who leaves the care of the workhouse school, that there should be one person at least to take this office, and to watch over and care for that child for Christ's sake? And surely the very simplest regulation of the Local Government Board might provide that when boy or girl leaves the workhouse some communication should be addressed either to the clergyman of the parish to which the child is sent, or to some central agency provided in this behalf.

2. But, again, there is another and yet more important means of giving help to the destitute child, and that is to rescue it from the workhouse control altogether. Think of the life of a child in great public establishments, the dull routine of daily duties, the mechanical obedience to rigid

rules, the entire and necessary absence of all personal care and affection, surely this is grievous training for a child.

Let the officers be ever so painstaking and efficient, it is utterly impossible for them to supply what the needs of childhood must demand. The State may furnish all that a child can want in food and clothing and instruction, but there is an important sphere of a child's life which it cannot enter. So long as children are trained up in these large institutions, it is impossible for them to get the personal love and affection which they need. Surely there can be no reason why Christian energy should not be permitted to fill the vacant place in the affections of the child. The experiment has been tried, and with the best results. It is found that there are numbers of persons, who, while they cannot undertake the cost of maintenance, are ready to bestow upon these pauper children just that which no paid official can give, and which is more precious than anything which can be purchased for the child. It is found that there is an available fund in English homes of thoughtful love and watchful care, which will supply to these poor children the greatest want which their destitution causes them —love to watch over them in childhood, and love to guide and direct them when they enter into life. Who is there that realises all the sweetness which is wrapped up in the one word Home, who will not understand what this means? Why should not this system be extended? Why should children be left to all the influences of pauper life, when a practicable mode of rescue is open for them? There are difficulties, no doubt. The guardians of the poor, many of them, are slow to understand the advantages of such a system; many are wedded to the plans which they have administered so long; and workhouse officials are naturally disinclined to extend a plan which causes so much, as they think, needless trouble in correspondence and accounts. But if this system, with all its wholesome influences, for the poor and for the rich who are responsible for their education, cannot be extended in concert with the guardians, cannot Christian sympathy and liberality come to the aid of children, and relieve the guardians altogether from the charge? What organised efforts have been made by the Church of England for the destitute children? Are there none whom the Church might try to rescue from a pauper's training and a pauper's fate? It is not in the workhouse alone that such children are to be found. In how many parishes are there those whom we would gladly help if the way were open; why not, then, extend the system for the benefit of those, for whose sake we are often called upon to work so assiduously, till we can by persistent begging find them a place in some great orphanage or asylum? Time would not permit me here to indicate the details of a scheme; but I cannot believe that it would be impossible or even difficult for those who have hitherto worked so nobly in this cause, to raise a fund which should be administered under their own direction for the benefit of orphans, in finding them not an asylum but a home. What I desire to see is an extension of the wise and thoughtful sponsorial system of our Church, and to provide that every child shall have some one to care for its spiritual and moral training. But in order to carry out this or any other plan of befriending the friendless, what we need is *personal help and personal care.* Not to relegate the children to a school, and then think that we have done all that duty demands, but to see that when an opportunity is given, we surround the child with the shelter of our love. How many

there are amongst our own relations or friends or dependants who might be aided in this way. I cannot believe that there is not enough of Christian unselfishness still left amongst us to undertake this work. These are "Women's rights," this is "Woman's work in the Church"—a work in which none can hope to rival or approach you. Many I know are working nobly in this cause. But there is urgent need for efforts, greater and more extended still. And if those efforts are made, though your praises may be unsung by man, the sweet music of pure childish love shall be your abundant reward; for "her children shall rise up and call her blessed."

ADDRESS.

Mr C. B. P. Bosanquet, Secretary of the London Charity Organisation Society.

I AGREE with most of what has been said in the papers, and there are some points I should like to emphasise. Mr Longley has given a true definition when he described organisation of charity as division of labour—it is an attempt to bring about a division of charitable labour. How far is this possible? It is possible, in the first place, to organise information in regard both to individual cases of distress, and to the agencies most likely to assist them. To make co-operation, which is another name for division of labour, possible, there must be some agreement as to principles—hence some principles had come to be associated with the organisation of charity. First among these I would place the necessity for relief being rendered, as far as possible, effectual and remedial. In London it has been much too easy, in some parts, for a person who asks assistance to get a shilling, while it is extremely difficult to get a pound; yet if a pound could be got in some cases it would be really valuable, whereas the shilling is often mischievous. It is a mistake to suppose that charity organisation societies are intended to do all the relief work of the public for it. Much more personal work is needed; and what is desired is to bring about such a change that there shall be more intercourse between the rich and the poor; yet, that in such intercourse the rich should be prepared to visit without dispensing relief at once, which I know is not easy. Visitors should be prepared to face disagreeables. They should combine sympathy for the individual with far-sightedness and some regard for general rules. In dealing with children, parental responsibility should not be disturbed without very strong reason. It is desirable that there should be some more precise division of labour between Industrial Schools and the Poor-law. In conclusion, I would strongly recommend the boarding-out of pauper children. It is a most admirable system for a limited class of cases, especially for orphan girls. The subject is of special interest to the Congress, from the fact that none are so well able to work such a scheme as the clergy; and that it gives their weekly-wage-earning parishioners an opportunity of co-operating with them in doing a most Christian work, and one which is charity in the highest sense.

DISCUSSION.

Commander W. Dawson, R.N.

I WISH to support the observations of my friends Mr Kitto and Mr Bosanquet as to the question of boarding-out children. I would point out to the Congress that in Ireland there are now some fifty-six local societies for the purpose of boarding-out orphan children of the Church of Ireland. It is carried out on a very large scale in each of the

thirty-two counties, and the Irish Church has a great deal of experience about it; therefore, I would beg to refer my friends Mr Kitto and Mr Bosanquet to the experience of that country. The plan is very simple indeed; the orphan child is not taken out of his own neighbourhood, but is placed as far as possible, certainly in the same diocese, if not in the same parish, with a family who are recommended by the clergyman of the parish. The annual average cost for boarding-out a labourer's orphan child, by the Tyrone Protestant Orphan Society, was, a few years ago, only £6, 10s. Before the family receive their yearly payment for the keep of the child, they must receive a certificate from the clergyman that the child has attended the parochial day and Sunday schools, has attended divine service on Sundays, and has been regularly visited by the district visitors at uncertain times. Now there can be no greater safeguard than that the Church's orphan shall be brought up in the same state of life in which it was born, and brought up as a member of a family, and accustomed to the duties and self-negations of a family, so that when it goes out into the world, it shall not be going out as from a monastery or a prison, having only learnt from description what social life in the outer world is like. If you visit these children in their adopted homes, you will find them much the same as the other children of the family, quite as dirty, quite as ragged, and quite as wanting in shoes, if that be the custom of the country. They are treated like the other children of the house—no better and no worse. They thus learn proper ideas as to how to assist in the work of the house, as a house is taken care of in their own class in life in that country. That is all you can expect and have a right to expect for the orphan children of the Church with reference to external circumstances; and you have in the family life so watched over by the Church's ministers and district visitors a safeguard that the Christian child is not brought up with its heart affections crushed out of it, as it is by the English system of crowding orphan children together by hundreds into an orphanage, which is only a large prison, and where anybody who has had infantile connections of their own incarcerated, and shut out from the ordinary life which God intended children to live, will agree with me that there is in force a most deplorable system for crushing out all the affections of the young heart. I wish that this particular point should receive the attention of the Congress and of clergymen generally, because I am quite satisfied it will not only be beneficial to the orphan children of the Church, but will give Churchmen and Churchwomen some work to do which would draw out the holiest energies of their hearts in doing that which I am quite sure Christ would wish them to do, namely, "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction;" for has He not said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

The Rev. Prebendary Edwards.

I WISH to say a word upon what has been already partially done in our own neighbourhood towards entering into relations with the guardians of the union, and, where a case has occurred of there being orphans in the union, finding out different parish homes where such children may be brought up in the habits of the cottage home to which they are confided. I think in the remarks which have been made upon charity this evening there has been, perhaps, too little said upon the great blessings in our charitable ministrations to the giver as well as to the recipients. We are extremely apt to forget that it is absolutely necessary to the formation of our own Christian characters that we should be brought into close contact with poverty and suffering; that we should not only part with the money which it may please the Almighty to give more largely to one than to another, but that we should for our own sakes, as well as for the sake of the poor whom we seek to relieve, personally visit them, that we may learn to sympathise with their wants and difficulties. With regard to the question of boarding-out, it seems

to have had some difficulty in making its way in the world; and yet in providing for the orphan child, especially the orphan girl of the union, we might in our country parishes most easily and most beneficially bear a part. God has placed these orphans in our charge. It is not the fault of the child, it is not the fault of the friends or parents, but by God's almighty wisdom, that this child has been left an orphan, and therefore is by God confided to us. When I have read of the large exportations of orphans to Canada—although no doubt such a work has been undertaken with feelings of kindness for the children, and attended in some respects with great advantage to them—I have always felt that if, in this rich country, we cannot take care of our own orphans, and bring them up with all those home-associations which belong to the country in which they have been bred and born, such exportation reflects some shame upon ourselves. Why should we not ask the clergymen of the rural parishes, "Are you disposed so far to co-operate with the guardians of a union who have orphans under their roof, as to tell us whether you have got any cottages in your parish to which these children can be confided; and cannot you find in your parish two or three ladies who will form a committee with yourself, the clergyman, for looking after these orphan children?" I speak from a limited experience of what I have observed in my own parish. Two or three children are boarded out in cottage homes, which of course I frequently visit. It is an obvious duty to call the attention of their neighbours to this or that child as being an orphan child; and I hope when the time comes for these children to go out into service, that they will go from these homes surrounded with friends who have had them under their eye for years past, and who in their different ways, by little gifts and little additions to their clothing, and so forth, have shown their good will towards these orphans, so that they will have every means supplied to them for making their way in the world that any child can expect who has been deprived by the wisdom of God of his natural guardians—the father and mother.

The Chairman.

Before we go to the next subject, I hope I shall be pardoned for making one or two remarks which occur to my mind. Much has been said to-night about the duty of the wealthy to contribute to the well-being of the poor, but not a word has been said upon how much the poor do themselves to assuage and alleviate the wants of the poor. There never has been a time when friendly societies and other organisations, originated by the poor themselves, have enrolled more members or contributed greater numbers to the members forming these associations. There are subjects in which as guardians we cannot help the poor, in which the poor by their own organisation help themselves: for instance, the removing of surplus labour from one part of the country to another where it is wanting, and contributing in a variety of ways to the well-being of the workmen; and no doubt we ought to recognise among other things that trades' unions have very largely promoted the welfare of the working classes in those particular respects, and also in another respect. It is a very great advantage for working-men to have the management and control of societies which so greatly affect their welfare. People do not learn to swim except they are put in the water, and there is no doubt that the training which workmen get by managing trades' unions and various friendly societies have a very beneficial effect indeed; and some of the most hopeful signs of the times, to my mind, upon the very grave subject of pauperism, arise from the fact that workmen are doing so much for themselves and for their fellow working-men. As having been myself an employer of labour, I should not fairly occupy the position of chairman of this meeting without saying this much, which I think is justly due to the merits of the working-men themselves and to the various organisations which they have established.

CHURCH WORK AMONG BOATMEN ON CANALS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. Canon Barclay.

No one can blame the Subjects' Committee of the Church Congress assembled at Stoke-upon-Trent for selecting, as one of the subjects for discussion, the Church's work amongst boatmen—those who man the barges, flats, scows, keels, narrow boats, paddle-boats, and billy-boys, by whatever name the craft may be called, which navigate our canals, rivers, and estuaries, in order to transport goods from the coast into the interior of the country, or produce and manufactured articles from the interior to our various seaports.

Such a subject is not only appropriate to the locality, but of no slight interest to the community, whether we consider the large population connected with our inland traffic, or the degraded and demoralised condition in which (with some honourable exceptions) the great bulk of them are lying.

It is calculated that there are some 5000 miles of rivers and canals in England; and the laborious and useful class of men employed thereon give, with their wives and children, a population of nearly 100,000 souls.

And what is the state of religion and morality amongst them? As a body, they are sunk into the lowest depth of moral degradation, the bulk of them being drunken, profane, and immoral characters; and although living in the midst of a Christian community, within sight of towering spires and within sound of chiming bells, many of them are ignorant even of the being of a God, and of that prayer which His Divine Son taught His followers.

That such is the general character of bargemen is proved by the evidence formally given some thirty years ago before a committee of the House of Commons, and very recently at Hanley, before the Factory and Workshops' Act's Commission—evidence corroborated by the testimony of all who have been brought into personal connection with them.

But how comes this to pass? What is there in the occupation of a boatman, considered in itself, which should tend to demoralise him? What is there in handling a rope, or plying an oar, or steering a barge, which should morally sink a man beneath his fellow-men, should make him more depraved, or less susceptible of religious impressions than the mechanic or any other labourer? Several causes are at work to account for this state of things.

1. The crowding together of men, women, and children, of whom 10,000 are living night and day on board boats and barges, where a family, perhaps of five or six, have to eat, drink, sleep, cook, and wash in a cabin six feet square. Can we expect much elevation of character or pure morals under such disadvantageous circumstances? I simply mention this point, however, to dismiss it from present consideration, as lying more within the province of the sanitary inspector and social reformer than of the Church.

2. Another cause of the moral degradation of boatmen is to be traced

to the want of education among their children. Moving as they continually are from place to place, they are beyond the reach of School Board officials, and so the "water babies" of our canals grow up not only in utter ignorance of the three R's, but too often of the God who made them, of the Lord who bought them, and the Spirit who would fain sanctify them. The remedy here seems to be some form of compulsory education, to be devised by the wisdom of the Legislature.

3. A third and very influential cause of the low state of morals and religion amongst boatmen, is doubtless to be found in the fact that they are almost universally deprived of the privileges of the Christian Sabbath, and compelled to toil on the day which affords to the poor their chief (sometimes their only) opportunities of gaining a knowledge of their duty to God and man. The competition of railway transit is so great and pressing, that carriers and proprietors of navigations cannot (or fancy they cannot) afford to suspend canal traffic on the Lord's-day. And although many boatmen are deeply sensible of their degraded condition, and feel their consciences wounded by Sabbath labour, can we wonder if they conform to the customs of their class, rather than lose their situations (which they would certainly do if they refused to work on Sundays), and deprive themselves and their families of their only means of subsistence?

Some navigation companies have indeed made regulations for suspending or diminishing Sunday traffic, but these regulations are constantly evaded by the men, an evasion which is too often winked at by their employers; nor do I see, for my own part, any prospect of stopping Sunday traffic upon canals and rivers, except by creating such a strong public opinion on the subject as may lead to legislative enactments, whereby traffic on roads and railways, as well as on canals, may be universally stopped.

4. Has the Church, then, no duty to perform to this portion of our population? Are they not as much as any other class, according to the theory of our parochial system, presumed to belong to some parish, and to be cared for by some parish priest? True: and yet in one sense they are no man's charge: for when they have no fixed residence, and their only home is on the waters; when they are constantly on the move, only remaining for a day or two in one place, where they may be discharging or taking in a cargo, it is not easy to see how they can become the subject of pastoral supervision. Is this class, then, to be left to perish like waifs and strays; practically excommunicated from the ministrations of the National Church? Can no means be devised whereby they may be brought under Christian influences? Surely in an age when scientific skill and commercial enterprise has conquered so many material and moral difficulties, Christianity as represented by the Church should be able to devise some expedient for reaching this, as well as every other class of our population. Nor are facilities wanting. There are certain places, *e.g.*, where cargoes are transhipped, and where consequently a number of barges are laid up for several days, sometimes for the Lord's-day. Here, therefore, is an opportunity for access to the boatmen on their barges and also for assembling them at a religious service, assuming (1.) that you have some one to visit them on their boats and conduct the service, and (2.) a room or boat where service may be held.

The first condition constitutes the chief difficulty; for usually these

places of resort are in populous parishes, where the clergyman's time is amply occupied with his resident population on a week-day; whilst the regular services, schools, and occasional offices of the Church so occupy him on a Sunday, that he has neither time nor energy for a special service on a boat or in a mission-room. How is this difficulty to be met? The first and most obvious method is to procure the services of a clergyman who shall devote his whole time and attention to the floating population, making them his special charge, visiting them on their barges or boats, holding prayer-meetings either afloat or at some convenient place ashore; arranging special services on Sundays in a building set apart for the purpose, or, if the weather be fine, in the open air, on the river bank, or the pier, or the deck of some of the larger barges, which the captain is generally willing to lend for such a purpose.

Such an agency I had working for many years in my own parish of Runcorn, where the Bridgewater Canal and the Old Quay unite with the river Mersey, and where are assembled in consequence of the spacious docks not only boatmen who traffic on the two canals, but seamen navigating coasters and foreign vessels. Here the Bridgewater Trustees provided the stipend of a resident minister, besides remunerating a layman who acted as his aide-de-camp, and providing a barge commodiously fitted up for the performance of divine service. In this floating church, a Mission Curate conducted Sunday and week-day services, superintended daily and Sunday schools especially meant for boat-children, visited the men on canal and river boats as also on sea-going vessels, and organised, in fact, any and every sort of machinery whereby the adult floating population connected with the port might hear the glad tidings of salvation through Jesus Christ, and their children might be brought under wholesome influences. The success of his efforts showed (1.) That boatmen are just as open to religious convictions as any other class; and (2.) That if boatmen are to be brought under spiritual influences, it must be done by a teacher solely set apart for their instruction, acquainted with their peculiar habits, and daily on the watch to seize the most favourable opportunities for gaining access to them. The work in question requires not only zeal and earnestness on the part of the missionary labourer (for a missionary indeed he is), but a certain amount of physical strength, and especially the power of adapting himself and his ministry to the varying circumstances of his charge. He must also have in his heart a depth of sympathy, to interest himself in their troubles. He must not be repelled by any apparent rudeness; and must have the tact to turn aside any rough edge that may be presented. Where is such a labourer to be found? are we to look for him in the ranks of the clergy or candidates for holy orders? I answer emphatically, No! When there is so great a lack of clergymen to supply the vacant posts in our town and country parishes, posts which require no exceptional qualifications in their holders; when there is such a lack of candidates for holy orders that the existing churches are inadequately supplied, how are mission services on boats and Bethels, in licensed rooms, school-chapels, and the like to be conducted? Why, the Church must employ for that purpose the spiritually-minded amongst the laity, who, without pressing forward into holy orders, may yet in a measure do the work of evangelists?

I believe that the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion numbers on its plans

11,000 local preachers, who give their services without price, though priceless in value, and to whose earnestness and homely preaching Methodism owes much of its vitality and power. Why should not the Church in this respect follow the example of Whitefield, Wesley, and their followers, and make lay readers (an order which many Bishops have formally sanctioned) not an occasional and exceptional, but a recognised part of her system? If the incumbent of every populous parish had a staff of such helpers to his ministry, in the same proportion as obtains in the Wesleyan body, where there are on the average eight local preachers to every travelling minister, what an army of evangelists would the Church possess, going forth Sunday after Sunday to preach Christ to the thousands and tens of thousands in our large towns and the scattered inhabitants of our rural hamlets, who are utterly careless about their souls, and never enter a place of Christian worship.

It is, I feel convinced, only by some such means as this that we can hope to overtake our teeming and increasing population ; and certainly it is only by some such means that we can bring the Church's ministrations to the boatmen on our canals and rivers, and awaken in them some anxiety for their soul's salvation. At the centres where boatmen congregate, and where the work of ministering to them will occupy a man's whole time, let a scripture reader be engaged, and if possible let him, in addition to other necessary qualifications, be either an ex-boatman, or one who has been in some way connected with canal and river traffic. The boatmen will be more likely to listen to him than to any outsider ; he will know their tempers and their ways ; he will enter into their difficulties and trials ; and will be better able to speak a word in season than a stranger with the best intentions in the world can possibly be. In foreign missions it is an acknowledged principle that native churches must be taught by native teachers. It is the man who speaks in the Hebrew tongue to whom a Hebrew audience will give the more silence. And so, if we would grapple with boatmen, we must call boatmen to our aid.

Nor would the scripture reader ever fail, as I can testify from personal experience, to find amongst the floating population some whose heart the Lord might open to hear the word spoken by a messenger of Christ. Let the reader make that man's boat a Bethel, and hold his service there, inducing him if possible to take a part therein. Supposing this plan to be pursued not in one but in many cases, then you have so many gospel agencies set afoot, a captain and his crew acting as missionaries to their mates and fellow-craftsmen.

I assume of course that the reader will work, if not in subordination to (which may not always be possible or even desirable), yet with the recognition of, and in harmony with, the parish priest, whose official services will be required, if for no other purpose, such as visiting the sick and dying, certainly for administering the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Boat people, I find, will more readily bring their children to a mission room or a floating chapel to be baptized, even though the office be performed in the course of the service, than they will take them to the parish church. It is no uncommon thing for myself and my coadjutors to baptize boat people's children at the week-day or Sunday-evening service in one of the mission churches; and on one occasion I remember baptizing five members of one family, some of whom were advancing towards adolescence. On the

same ground, when boatmen come to the Lord's table, it is at a mission rather than the mother church, and usually in consequence of affectionate exhortation on the part of the mission curate or scripture reader.

The scheme I have ventured to suggest applies only to centres where boatmen are to be found in considerable numbers, and where systematic visitation and regular services are essential. But how is the Church to reach the crew of the solitary barge, tied up for the Sunday in some remote country district, miles away from any place of worship? I answer, by a similar but unpaid agency. Let the solitary barge, or little group of barges, be considered as an outlying hamlet, and treated as such. Surely in every parish some earnest layman might be found who would make it his special business on the Lord's-day to read the Scriptures, and speak the Word of Life to the poor bargemen who will not—in many cases cannot—resort to the distant house of prayer.

At any rate, let us not justify ourselves in our neglect of this portion of our fellow-countrymen by a notion that all effort on their behalf is vain. There is no class which is hopelessly beyond the scope of missionary enterprise. True it is that, without special and well-directed efforts on our part, there is no possibility, humanly speaking, for these men ever coming within hearing of the good news of God. But should not the Church organise such a special effort? Are criminals in prison, paupers in workhouses, and patients in infirmaries to enjoy the benefits of pastoral superintendence and religious instruction; and are the men who navigate the peaceful river or the quiet canal to remain the only class excluded from these privileges? Let not such a reproach lie at the Church's door! Let her employ any and every agency, paid or unpaid, clerical or lay, which will convey the balm in Gilead, the healing medicine of the gospel, the divine prescription of the Great Physician, to sick and dying souls. She will find that the Word of God is not bound; that the common people hear Jesus as gladly now as when He himself taught them on board the fishing boats of Galilee, and that there is nothing whatever in the calling of a bargeman to militate against a heartfelt reception of the truth as it is in Jesus.

"The boatman needs our aid,
Can we stand idly by,
Helpless and useless, all afraid,
And let him drift or die?
So did not Jesus on Tiberias' lake,
Oh! let us help our sailors for His sake."

Commander W. Dawson, R.N., Secretary, Missions to Seamen Society.

Forty years ago, when a young clergyman originated Church work on shipboard, his ministrations were freely given alike to the "trowmen" of the Severn and of the other tributary waters of the Bristol Channel, and to the merchant fleets in its outer roadsteads. As the merchant shipping which carries the commerce of England to the ends of the earth lie windbound for weeks in certain sheltered anchorages, so the barges which, laden with valuable cargoes, navigate the various canals which intersect the country, often lie tide-bound and wind-bound, congregated in fleets

at various points of refuge. Thus it happened, that far away from their midland homes, the bargemen of Shropshire and Warwick, Gloucestershire and Somerset, Hereford and Worcestershire, were found isolated from external disturbing influence in the creeks of Gloucestershire and South Wales, in positions afloat most favourable to pastoral visitation.

Neglected and uncared-for as were the population living afloat, some forty years ago, it is needless to say that the chaplain of the Missions to Seamen had occasionally some rather rough encounters with the canal boatmen of the Midland Counties. Nevertheless as he went from barge to barge explaining the cause of his visit, kneeling down with them in their confined cabins, talking with them of the love of Him who died for them as for us, and inviting them to attend the Church's services, either on the deck of one of their own vessels, or in the cabin of his little mission yacht, the chaplain often had the truth brought home to his own conviction, that beneath the unwashed exterior,

> "Man is God's image, but a poor man is
> Christ's stamp to boot: both images regard."

On one occasion, in 1841, after a somewhat rude reception, when the chaplain had explained that he was the Church's messenger to those who reside on the waters, and that he wished to have a return visit from them on board the mission yacht, one of the bargemen turned round to the rest and said, "There, then, there is a chance for us now. Shouldn't you like to go? I should." He then turned to the chaplain and said, "I have been working in these vessels many years, and my master has never given me a Sunday yet, nor a chance of going anywhere; and he says, if I don't work for him on Sundays, I shan't on other days, and I have seven children, and can't give up the bread,—but now there is a chance for us when we are down here waiting for the tide. We'll pull round under your stern, and come alongside of you when you have a service on board, if you'll allow us."

The chaplain reports that these bargemen took copies of his Church signals, and called to the boatmen in the other barges, who when they found what was the object of the chaplain's visit, invited him on board and bought from him two Prayer-Books and a Testament that day.

Many hundred Prayer-Books and Bibles were subsequently sold, and religious books lent to these bargemen, by whom they were spread across country and up northward into the heart of the Midland Counties. Nor is testimony wanting that the seed thus sown amongst boatmen waiting alongside the wharves, or moored at long distances from home, bore good fruit amongst wives and families in cottages far away from the original sower. Lay it to heart that when men are far from home, the holiest memories of the most blessed bygone moments, and of the dearest absent friends, are most likely to be aroused by a heartfelt use of the evangelical liturgy of our Scriptural Church. To the very roughest characters

> "'Tis something that we kneel and pray
> With loved ones near and far away;
> One Lord, one faith, one hope, one care,
> One form of words, one common prayer!"

Narrating the hearty reception given to "the minister" by the boatmen

in 1845, after a long absence, the Missions to Seamen chaplain proceeds: "These *trowmen* seem to receive me with even more readiness than formerly, and my opportunities of holding services amongst them are numerous, even during the severity of the present season. In the late tempestuous weather, I have preached three or four times in the day, on board their vessels in Kingroad. The poor men assembled from other trows, on board the *Union*, on the 2d November, said, in a body, as I was leaving, 'We can but thank you, sir.' The wind was high at the time, the difficulties of assembling were great, and if all our friends on shore could have seen the readiness with which these difficulties were encountered by the men, they would have been surprised and pleased. On the last Lord's-day, beginning at an early hour and ending late at night, I had an opportunity of preaching amongst them, on board different vessels, six times."

The clergyman who succeeded to the Bristol chaplaincy of the Missions to Seamen Society, has also frequently visited the bargemen who trade from Berkshire and Wiltshire to Bristol, to whom the Canal Company furnish a Bible for each barge. And writing after long experience of the trowmen he says:—"Many a happy service have I held in their rather dirty cabins, and often have I testified on their decks to a responsive audience. Under God this Mission has helped to change the moral and religious aspect of this class for the better."

Within the last twenty years, the Missions to Seamen Society has extended its operations on the waters to 32 different seaports, whereat 40 hon. chaplains, and 15 mission clergy, assisted by 31 scripture readers and 3 paid lay-helpers, are working amongst the population living afloat. Canal boatmen from the inland counties are visited on board their barges by those of its agents who are stationed on the Severn, the Medway, the Thames, the Humber, the Tees, the Tyne, and the Mersey. From these points radiate canals, many of the boatmen on which carry to the surrounding counties, besides the material produce of the world, the Word of God which abideth for ever.

Occasionally the Missions to Seamen agent follows the barges up the canals, visiting the men working on the wharves, at the locks, and in the water-tenders, as well as the population resident on the waters. In a recent boat excursion of seventy-two miles up and down the Medway into the very heart of Kent, the Missions to Seamen reader boarded, as he went along, 149 barges in three days, speaking to or reading with 268 men and boys forming their crews, besides the women and children living on board. In this single inland voyage, 88 small books and 380 tracts were given to persons whose isolation ensured attentive reading. Here in the very heart of the lovely county of Kent, whose inhabitants think it the garden of England, the reader found a neglected field of labour, such as few have any idea of who have not been barge visitors. A large number of men, women, and children, lying alongside wharves close to churches, and seldom more than one mile from the parish church, are yet never invited to the house of God, nor visited for spiritual instruction, except in some extra-parochial way such as the Missions to Seamen employs. Yet there are in the 58 miles of the Medway, from Tunbridge to Sheerness, at least 30 parishes where barges lie close to, or within less than one mile of the church, for several days together, with men living on board. Sunday traffic is discouraged by the Medway company.

There are about 600 men and 50 families living on board the 500 barges which trade regularly with Rochester, where the parochial clergy are assisted by a Mission to Seamen reader: who since Christmas last has paid 640 visits, and given 114 Bibles, 216 prayer-books, 96 hymn-books, and 320 cards of prayer, besides various other publications. Two extracts from the reader's journal tell the two sides of the story:—

"April 6th, 1875, . . . Barge 9. Man, wife, and four children, all very young, in a dirty, sad state. The cabin floor does not contain more than twenty-five square feet, and in a most miserable state. The woman is scarcely ever on shore, and of course never attends any place of worship. There was no prayer, and their life was one of continual work and toil."

"April 12th, 1875. The captain of the barge being a Christian man, we read God's Word, and sang plenty of hymns, and sought our Heavenly Father's blessing, thanking Him for thus bringing us safely on our way some eighty miles."

An agent of the Missions to Seamen in London devotes two days in each week to visiting afloat the bargemen of Warwickshire, Oxfordshire, and Middlesex during their stay in the Regent's Canal Dock, which they reach by the Warwick, Oxford, Grand Junction, and Regent Canals. The Church of England Scripture Reader's Society furnishes agents to two parishes for the service of bargemen on canals in Essex; but, so far as I can find out, nothing is done for those who reside upon the eight and a half miles of Regent's Canal, by the parochial agency at the ten points where barges lie alongside wharves from periods of from two to seven days.

During the last six months, the Missions to Seamen reader visited 500 barges on the Regent's Canal, distributing Bibles, prayer-books, and hymn-books, and reading the Scriptures to their inhabitants. Farther supplies of disused Bibles, prayer-books, hymn-books, and other religious works would be thankfully accepted, if sent in parcels, hampers, or boxes to the Missions to Seamen, 11 Buckingham Street, Strand, London, W.C. Some 5000 barges (including repeated voyages) annually pass into the Regent's Canal at Paddington, where a splendid field of labour lies almost wholly untilled in the most aristocratic neighbourhood in London, and in otherwise well-worked parishes. There are 17 different wharves in Paddington, where sometimes 40 to 60 barges, each carrying two men, and often two to six children, lie for several days together without being visited. Many of the children unbaptized, many of the parents unmarried, and no church in that spiritually rich and influential deanery admits them to worship or cares for their souls. The children living afloat are not known to attend Sunday schools, and few of the parents are known to attend church. Family worship is known in very few cases, and many do not use Bibles, even if they possess them.

Two city missionaries devote a couple of hours on Sunday afternoons to visiting the barges, and a few boatmen attend their mission hall. Those who reside on shore are no doubt included in the general parochial visitation, &c.; but those who reside afloat seem otherwise neglected.

In the other 159 miles of canal which intervene between London and Birmingham, the bargemen are never out of a parish, and might easily be visited at the various wharves where they stop to load and unload.

About 18,000 barges (including repeated voyages) annually enter the short Surrey Canal; or about 60 fresh entries per day. About 7000 men live on board,—many of them with their families. There are six points on the Surrey Canal at which these barges lie two or three days at a time to unload. At one of these points, Ploughbridge, there are some 50 or 60 wharves. In these parishes no provision appears to exist for visiting this large floating population, for inviting them to the parish churches, or for receiving and welcoming them should they so present themselves at the house of God.

At Hull, where the Missions to Seamen has a chaplain and a scripture reader for the population residing afloat, about 6615 persons arrived in the keels and 3654 persons in lighters, during the single month of August last. Upwards of 100 keels and lighters per day arrive and depart from Hull. The chaplain states that there is an average of about three children to each keel, and that many of the families remain on board for weeks together. His time being more than fully occupied with the shipping, he is quite unable to cope with the canal population, and has, moreover, no church or Sunday school to which they might be invited and made welcome. Much less can he follow this nomad population up the canals to the various wharves where they unload, and where being in smaller numbers they could be more effectually visited and taken to the several places of worship.

Time forbids to record the work done by the Missions to Seamen amongst boatmen residing afloat on the Tyne and the Mersey; and to name the work done by the Church on the canals at Worcester and Gloucester, &c. For further information, see the *Word on the Waters*, a quarterly record of mission effort amongst our floating population, to be had through any bookseller. The sum total, however, bears a very small proportion to the wharves alongside which the boatmen live uncared for. Enough has been said to show what abundant hope there is that more abundant Church work amongst boatmen on canals would be abundantly rewarded.

Shocking as is, no doubt, the overcrowding in the cabins, where families live on board; the lack of educational facilities for the children; and the defective sanitary conditions of the barges,—these are no worse than the conditions of life under which many good Christian people glorified God by devout lives in past generations, and under which godly men and women do so still.

On the canals, as on shipboard, no less than ashore, God has chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, heirs of His kingdom. However desirable it may be to amend both the physical and the educational position of boatmen on canals, the Church's experience on *terra firma* must surely have taught us that the soul's salvation is not wholly dependent on such extraneous matters. If the life-giving ministrations of the gospel be withheld till the legislature and the schoolmaster have done their work, the Church certainly will not be emulating the example of our blessed Lord or of His apostles.

If the problem be attacked parochially, there will be little difficulty in resolving it. There are, it is supposed, some 5000 miles of rivers and canals in England, in which some 30,000 men get their living by working barges and boats in the carrying trade. But the families of the great

majority of these men reside on shore; and the idea is that only about 10,000 men, women, and children make their permanent homes on board boats and barges. Though cramped up in little cabins, in which the parents cannot always stand upright, and in which decency seems difficult, barge life offers singular advantages to pastoral visitation. People living afloat are generally to be found at home, and sufficiently isolated to welcome a visitor. Moreover, when their floating homes happen to be at a distance from friends, a yet more complete isolation makes the visitor's call especially acceptable. The fact that the outward circumstances of life are somewhat different from the rest of the world, makes any specially devout habits less remarkable, and less open, therefore, to the social disabilities that holy living sometimes brings upon the poor. Daily family worship is, *e.g.*, a comparatively easy matter on board barges. Solitude for reading and devout meditation has its home there. And, in short, that portion of personal religion which is independent of the public means of grace, has, to the willing heart, special freedom on board barges. But, "how shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

Every well-worked parish has its band of lay helpers: some acting as district visitors; others as Sunday-school teachers; others as conductors of mission services; and others going out "into the highways and hedges," or "into the streets and lanes of the city" to compel people to come in so that God's house may be full. Why should not similar parochial agency be extended to canals, where a wharf exists in the parish?

At the more crowded stations, such as the Regent's Canal Dock, the City Road Basin, the Paddington Wharves, the Surrey Canal, the Hull Docks, &c., let a canal curate be attached to a church willing to "entertain strangers," and have the support of a parochial organisation. He may possibly require the use of a boat to cross over from wharf to wharf; and of a room on the banks to receive the children for religious instruction. At less important points, let the parochial clergy have on their staff a canal scripture reader, to spend his life in bringing the canal folk under the ordinary ministrations of religion. And, wherever wharves are found for loading or unloading the ones and twos, let the lay helpers of the parish include amongst their body barge visitors, barge teachers, barge missioners, and those who will endeavour to "compel" boatmen and their families to attend the public means of grace.

It is not so much new methods, much less a new religion, that is wanted for those who reside afloat, as a common sense adaptation of the old methods to this not altogether new purpose. The one great difficulty in thus securing for boatmen and their families a share in the parochial heritage received from our forefathers, arises within the church edifice itself. It is of little use bringing people to the church doors, until some arrangement is made for making them welcome within. If the cold shoulder of the pew-closer is to be his only welcome to God's house, all our discussions over the absence of boatmen from the means of grace is sheer hypocrisy. Sweep pride and selfishness from our church-sittings, and appoint some of the communicants to "entertain strangers" as they appear at the church doors, and to attend them to suitable seats, furnish-

ing them with prayer and hymn-books, and showing them where to find the places therein. Till the spirit of kindness and attention to such "strangers" is fostered in our churches, there will be many more "strangers" to their services than the long-neglected boatmen on canals.

Oh! that God would heal "our unhappy divisions," and "take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord"—then might the zeal now employed upon "foolish and unlearned questions which gender strifes," the ingenuity developed in mutual suspicions and party rancours, and the energies wickedly wasted in biting and devouring one another, be united in more Christ-like activities; and then might the now grieved Holy Spirit, the God of "love, joy, and peace," return and breathe once again into His people such a love for perishing souls around as was in a humbled lay helper of the ancient Church when he wrote: "Oh give me the comfort of Thy help again, and stablish me with Thy free Spirit; then shall I teach Thy ways unto the wicked, and sinners shall be converted unto Thee."

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. T. W. Carr, M.A., Rector of Barming, Kent.

I only wish to give an illustration which is drawn forth by the interesting paper of Commander Dawson, and which is due, I think, to the barge people on the canals. I have myself a parish which is just a mile along the river Medway. I have not, I am sorry to say, done anything with the people of the barges which pass up and down, nor was I aware of the particular work upon the Medway to which he has referred; but I remember a little incident, which I have no doubt was the effect of some of that work, and I am sure it will interest those who hear it. I was standing by the river (not following my calling, for I had a fishing-rod in my hand), and was sheltered by some bushes from the river, when, presently, upon the other side, which was the towing-path, a horse came by with the rope of a barge, from which I heard the sound of voices. The sounds that come from a barge are not always agreeable in regard to the language, but upon this occasion, to my surprise, I heard the words of the Creed just before the barge swept past me. I was then quite out of their sight, but saw a woman steering the barge, with a little boy seated in front of her, to whom she was teaching the words of the Creed. Perhaps that may have been some fruit of the work of the reader to whom Commander Dawson referred.

The Rev. R. Morrison Herdman, Association Secretary of Missions to Seamen.

The fact of our gathering here this evening shows that we as a Church are conscious of having neglected the floating population on the canals, but it shows also that as a Church we are now, as it were, becoming alive to our responsibilities, else why are we introducing such a subject as this to our Church Congress? The parochial system, from a combination of causes, has failed in the case of our bargemen, as it has failed in the case of our seamen. The whole discussion of the subject is based on the failure of the means that have hitherto been employed, and the operations hitherto carried on. We cannot suppose that the clergy, through whose parishes the different canals flow, are in any way less diligent in the discharge of their duties, or less watchful for the

souls of men, than their neighbours. It seems, therefore, that we must trace the lamentable condition of the residents in barges to a defect in our organisation. A canal is not merely a part of a parish, but parts of many parishes. While the barge people are in a clergyman's parish he may, if his ordinary parochial duties will allow him to do so, visit them, but the moment they have crossed the bounds of his parish, they are no longer his parishioners, and he cannot officiate among them. The better part of the existence of the inhabitants of the barges is spent, not at wharves and quays, but on voyages. To-day they are in the parish, to-morrow they may be in another miles away. To what parish do they belong? The only rational conclusion is, that they require a special agency—an agency which will be willing to rough it, and to rough it amongst the roughest of the rough. I remember when I was ordained by the Right Rev. Prelate who rules this diocese, hearing a remark from his son, who is now occupying the place where one of the latest martyrs of our Church—namely, Bishop Pattison—met his death and won his crown. I remember hearing a remark from that son, a short time before he left this diocese and also this country, to this effect. He said—"The first remembrance I have of my father is one stormy night, among the islands of the Pacific, coming up from the cabin, and seeing him dressed in a rough pilot jacket and a sou'-wester." I felt at that time, and I feel now, that if we wish to have men to do effectual work among our bargemen they must be something like our worthy Bishop, men who are willing to be roughly clad, and ready to go out and work among the men where the men are to be found. Our Bishop has set us a noble example—an example which the chaplains of the Society "Missions to Seamen" are now following in the roadsteads, docks and rivers around our coast, as, going out rough men among the rough they take to the perishing mariner that message which our Blessed Lord was so willing, nay, loved to take to the very poorest of the poor. When Christ came among men the Rabbis were seeking for learned congregations; but what did He do? away He went down into the alleys of the Temple City, into the streets of the provincial towns, away into the homes of the poor villagers, and into the boats of the toiling fishermen, yea, wherever He could find the "sheep without a shepherd" thither He went and spoke to them the words of life; and what was the result? Christ first sought the people, then the people sought Him; and after that they began to follow Him, and at length they even went before Him to where they thought He would be, and they were, as we find, benefitted by His teaching. We must be more willing to seek the barge people. Manifestly if any good is to be done among them, it can only be done by men expressly set apart for that special work. The work should not be left to hinge upon accident, but should be prosecuted on a pre-arranged and settled plan. I see from the October number of the *Word on the Waters* which I hold in my hand, that Bishop Selwyn recommends a staff of "clergymen living upon the canals to follow the barges, and baptize and teach the children, and humanise, nay, christianise the parents on board." Let the Church employ such a special agency; let her not merely talk about it: let her not stand upon the order of her doing, but do it at once, and these loving earnest men, specially set apart in the different dioceses where the bargemen are to be found working faithfully in their appointed sphere—will, we believe, receive the blessing of the Saviour—the Worker among the poor—and be instrumental in bringing into the heavenly fold many of the long scattered, wandering, and lost ones on the canals.

Our Bishop has struck the key-note, let us respond to it and send out men among bargemen as the Society "Missions to Seamen" sends them among sailors, and then I fancy the long neglected and difficult problem will be speedily solved.

The Rev. J. Gott, D.D., Vicar of Leeds.

I have a very great interest in this work, as I was for five years chaplain to the Wherryman's Mission at Yarmouth, where the five rivers which water the whole of Norfolk and Suffolk enter the sea. When I went there in 1857, a floating town

of 2000 souls was living without either church or home. As an illustration of their character I remember, after a long visit I had paid to a barge, which had given me an opportunity of speaking to the owner's heart, his way of showing his appreciation was by sending me a hare which he poached as he came down the river. A brother curate, Mr Pellew, a name famous on the water, began to preach on the river on Sunday afternoons, or any fine summer evening. Early in November, when winter closed in, he obtained the loan of a sail-loft from a merchant on the quay, and when he broke down, the Mission among the River Population was put into my hands. We opened a Sunday school, and the police sent us all the children who were beyond their management. At length we finished our church, to which we gradually added an institute and a Sunday school; a lady gave a boat, which passed from barge to barge, and was often weeks together up the river. We had a scripture reader, a young sailor, who had lost his leg at sea; and when I applied to the Additional Curates' Society for a curate, they replied that I was beyond their field of action. The heart of their secretary was so touched that he gave me £15 a year out of his own pocket, and persuaded one of his friends to double it. I had 156 church-workers among the people, for besides my wherrymen I had 5000 people on land, who lived along the river banks. As time wore on, a public-house of the worst character was given to us. It was the chief rendezvous in Yarmouth for gamblers and smugglers, and at least one murder and a suicide had been committed within its walls; its licence had been forfeited, and it was put into our hands to white-wash. So the work went on until Sunday labour almost ceased, and drinking and swearing became rare. The church was so crowded that it usually held 700 on a Sunday evening, although only seated for 500; and I remember one bright evening when the crowd, unable to enter the church, remained outside with their hats off, and their prayer-books open, throughout the service, and contributed a good share to the offertory, when the plate was handed half across the street. At an Additional Curates' Meeting in Kent the deputation described the scene I have been describing to you. The result was that a clergyman of Gravesend hired a public-house where he held services; a boat was given to him, in which he visited the Thames barges as they passed up and down the river; he built a church which he called St Andrew's, after ours at Yarmouth. Presently a merchant from China, who had made a fortune, came and settled there, and was so struck with the work that he was ordained, and afterwards became vicar of that parish; he brought the work to a most successful issue, and the last time I saw him he told me that a brother merchant whom he had known in China, had come to spend a few days with him, and had been so pleased at the work that was going on, that he asked his friend to receive £100 a year as his contribution to the work. We have only, then, to put our shoulders heartily and prayerfully to this work among our barges, and it will bear fruit on every river and canal, and contribute no small blessing to the welfare of the National Church.

The Rev. T. Tomlinson.

I HAVE just one suggestion to make, and I make it now, because I think there are others who may be able to carry it out far better than I can myself. I firmly believe, from what little I know of the population on our canals, that our only hope is with the children, and the suggestion which I wish to make, and which I intend to try and carry into effect in my own parish is this, to get the children from these boats, and put them in a school in the village. I hope to obtain some suitable house where they can be boarded, perhaps a barn, or a cottage, or something of that sort, furnish it roughly, get

a matron or a master to look after the children, and then, if practicable, send them to our parochial schools. I have been talking to some of the boatmen about it, and I believe they would give up their children for this purpose, at least some of them would. I understand that there are in one of the canals which traverses my parish, no less than 500 children passing backwards and forwards during the year, who live altogether upon the boats, and I thought it very practicable in this way to get hold of some of the children. I mention this here, that this suggestion may be taken up by others, and carried into effect in other parts of England far better than I can do it. I believe the only hope is with the children.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, 6th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took the Chair, in the Congress Hall, at a Quarter-past Ten.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: PUPIL TEACHERS: THE CHURCH AND SCHOOL BOARDS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. W. J. Kennedy, M.A., Inspector of Schools

I proceed, according to the request made to me, to read a paper on Religious Education in Elementary Schools. The subject cannot be adequately treated in the time allowed, and I must try to use much compression. But compression causes one to speak with fewer qualifications, and with more appearance of dogmatism, than is desirable; also, one runs great risk of being misunderstood.

I desire to guard myself, also, by another remark, viz., that when I may have to speak of producing any good religious result by human means, God's help is always understood as needful, for "except the Lord build the house their labour is but lost that build it."

Religious instruction may be classed under two heads; one relates to the teaching of the brain through books; the other to teaching the heart by example and practice.

And first I will say a few words on the former head—on the brain teaching, and the curriculum of book teaching in our elementary schools. I fear that in many schools a better syllabus is needed both for scholars and pupil-teachers. We ought never to forget that *time*—the time we have for the work—is an important element in determining what we shall teach and what books we should use. Looking to the short time during which we have hold of our scholars and pupil-teachers, and the short time each day which can be given to religious knowledge, and looking to all which we might desire to teach thoroughly, viz., the Bible, the prayer-book, Church history, and all that is collaterally involved in such teaching, we are bound to make up our minds from the first, that very much which we should like to teach must be omitted from

our teaching at school. We must adopt for our rule the teaching what is most vital, and the not leaving the rest untaught if we can help it. I confess that, looking to the briefness of our opportunities, I think mistakes are made—that we teach our children and pupil-teachers much that is not essential, and then find that we have not time for what is more vital. Nay, more, I am of opinion that we often call much by the name of "religious knowledge" which scarcely merits the name, and so misuse our brief time and opportunities. Moreover, in teaching religious knowledge, we must take another element into consideration besides *time*. We have to consider our *agents* in this teaching, who the persons are that have to work it out, and to make comments, and impart all requisite explanations. Here, again, is an important factor in considering what should be selected as the subject-matter of instruction. If the teachers of our elementary schools are to impart the religious knowledge, I must frankly express my fear that there may be much nominally taught, which our schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, for the most part, cannot be expected to be competent to teach well and wisely. Much erroneous teaching will go on, and does go on now, and much future danger arises from the errors made. For, remember, there is serious danger of upsetting truth itself when truth is made to rest on a wrong basis or a wrong argument. If the facts, or the reasoning, on which you rest truth, are found by your scholars in their after life to be unsound, their belief in the truth itself may probably be overthrown. Let me briefly refer you to some admirable remarks on this point, in the first chapter of the tenth book of Aristotle's Ethics.

But passing from these general remarks and negative criticisms to suggestions of a more practical character, I would suggest that there should be much less of the Old Testament taught in our elementary schools, and more time given to the New Testament. Not that I love the Old Testament less but that I love the New Testament more; and surely we all of us as Christians owe much more to the New Testament than to the Old. Then, again, the danger of incorrect teaching attaches much more to the Old than to the New Testament. Nay, I will go further, and admit my conviction that great part of what the children and pupil-teachers are made to learn from the Old Testament as religious knowledge, is not religious knowledge at all. I refer especially to the details of the biographies which they are made to get up, as, for instance, about all the Judges and Kings of Judah and Israel and work of that sort, on which so much time is consumed, and which time I would far rather have employed in mastering thoroughly the life and all the sayings of Christ, upon the study of the New Testament generally, on the Catechism, and on some well-written and approved Church History. As regards the Old Testament, I recommend specifically that it be taught in our schools by the use of a short and wisely prepared manual, and through such a manual only as a rule. Not merely does time seem to require this plan, but, as I said before, the body of our teachers, male and female, cannot be learned enough to teach the Old Testament in very many parts wisely and safely, and danger arises unless the teaching of such parts be restricted to a well-prepared text-book.

And this mention of a text-book leads me to offer two more practical suggestions. One is that the Church of England ought to get various text-books—three or four on each subject—approved and generally

agreed upon as suitable for all the religious teaching in our elementary schools.

The other suggestion is, that we ought to take much more pains and go to some, even to much, expense, in seeing to it that all our pupil-teachers and all our scholars of a certain age are provided with the approved text-books; so that they may study them for themselves, and so that what, from want of time, we wisely omitted attempting to teach in the school may be read and studied at home in leisure hours and after school life is over. Such a home library would be invaluable in this subject, as indeed in secular subjects too, and is an object worth being aimed at. We should have more missionary zeal in (and for) this our own country. We should follow our scholars to their homes and their home life, and see to it that in some way or other there are in the home of every scholar not only Bibles and Prayer-Books, but also a manual of scripture history, a Church history, a book of devotion, a card of prayers, and not least of all a small book containing a few—and I mean a few only—of the most poetical and touching of our hymns.

I would add, let there be a volume containing a few well-selected poetical extracts of the very highest order, such as Coleridge's hymn before sunrise in the vale of Chamouni; for refinement, taste, the imagination, and a sense of beauty, should be cultivated; and I mention them here because they exercise no unimportant influence in religious culture.

So much, then, about religious instruction in our elementary schools as a matter of brain work and book teaching.

In the second place, leaving that teaching which concerns head work,—leaving, I say, the teaching derived from books and all such learning as is to be reproduced at the pupils' examinations, I proceed to speak about that religious instruction which concerns the conscience and the heart, and is to be the guide of their lives.

Here we come upon a consideration of the gravest character, and rendered very specially grave by the times in which our lot is cast. We are living in no common times: it is high time we Christians and Churchmen should realise this fact. At this stage of the world's history Christianity is being sorely tried: and the grand danger of all to the soul lies in what is called materialism. We all love science and wish to teach science: and we are grateful to men of science, not only for material benefits, but for the light they may have thrown on the interpretation of Scripture, for we all love truth above all things. *Amicus Plato magis amica veritas.* But against the doctrines of those scientific men who preach a pure materialism, and deny "the Lord and Giver of life," let us wage a ceaseless battle, bravely, perseveringly, and wisely withal; not preaching against materialism, but preoccupying the young soul with antidotes against the poison. But how shall we accomplish this? How shall we administer the antidote in our schools? I answer, by engrafting in the souls of our young scholars a lively sense of conscience, and of God, and of immortality, as a groundwork: and I fear that without this groundwork whatever religious structure we might build up would be ever in danger nowadays of collapsing in utter ruin.

It was Samuel Taylor Coleridge, I think, who sagaciously observed that every one was in soul an Aristotelian or a Platonist: which means, in other words, that every one has a bent either to materialism or to what I

will call spiritualism. Now we want to make our scholars Platonists: we want them to feel that they are spirits, connected with an unseen world and a world to come; we want them to feel, in the words of the great Richard Hooker, that "man doth seek a triple perfection,"—not only, first, a perfection of body, and secondly, a perfection of mind, but thirdly, a perfection of spirit—of that part of him which "maketh him yearn after somewhat divine and heavenly," as Hooker phrases it, and which connects him with God through the conscience and the affections.

Well, two questions then arise for us: first, as to the *age when* we should commence this our religious teaching of a child; and secondly, as to the *means*, as to *how* we can all promote it, and how it should be taught in our schools.

We are often attacked for teaching religion to very young children, but I doubt not but that we are quite right. "Heaven lies about us in our infancy," as the poet says, while "our souls have sight of that immortal sea which brought us hither." Yes, assuredly, childhood is the season—perhaps humanly speaking the only season—for moulding the soul irrevocably to what I will venture to call the truth, *i.e.*, to a lively sensitive condition of conscience and all that is implied by it. For conscience implies a judge in the background who knows our thoughts, and condemns or approves; in other words, it implies an ever-present personal God with whom we hold communion, and Who is granting to us here on earth that power of choice between good and evil which determines character. But, then, *when* is conscience least dulled, least clogged, comparatively untainted, and most clear and open, so that like an empty mortice the tenon of truth can duly enter and fit without serious impediment? Surely in childhood. That is the season for engrafting a living sense of God and immortality and responsibility.

It is important also to remember that the impressions of childhood, and the things learned in childhood, remain and abide with us best in age, and are for us a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί.

Finally, having endeavoured to show that childhood is the fit time for awaking in the soul those "truths that wake to perish never"—that it is the season of life when we should begin to inculcate practical religion, I proceed, lastly, to say a few words as to the means, as to how the work may be best promoted, and specially as to how it may be best taught in our elementary schools.

One word to school managers. Knowing all I do—how one teacher tells his scholars to cheat the inspector by helping each other, how another tells her scholars to personate absentees, how another falsifies his registers daily—thus teaching their scholars that there is no conscience and no God—I cannot omit imploring school managers to use increased care in the choice of a teacher, if they wish to promote practical religion among the scholars. Choose your teacher, I say, far more for a strict conscientiousness than for being a smart grant-earning teacher. I yield to no one in anxiety to promote secular learning and intellectual development. But religious training need not impede or curtail mental improvement. The mind needs goodness as well as cleverness, especially for all the practical affairs and conduct of life. Moral insight is as necessary as intellectual power, and the danger nowadays is lest religion go to the wall.

But we will suppose we have got our religious and conscientious teacher,

who will not suffer religon to go to the wall,—and thank God! there are many such,—what can he do in the way of training a child in the religion of the heart and practical piety? He can do wonders if his heart be in the work.

Speaking generally, let all his religiousness be perfectly unostentatious, but at the same time let him never lose sight of a good opportunity of showing his sense of our spiritual and immortal nature, and of a superintending Providence. The air of the schoolroom should be pervaded by such belief. Speaking more particularly, let there be a careful inculcation of duty throughout the school; but still more, far more, let the teacher show a marked conscientiousness on his own part in the discharge of every duty. Let him be punctual in coming to school, diligent in school, strict and careful in observing his time table, and patiently honest in keeping his register. Let him set a manifest and practical value on the school prayers, and let him be simply reverent and earnest in conducting them. There is no teaching like example. The scholar becomes what the teacher *is*. He who would shape a conscientious life in others must be ever shaping that same life in himself.

Moreover, the teacher ought, as far as possible, to make a special study of the character and disposition of each scholar: different temperaments require different treatment. And still further, the teacher should show and feel, as far as he can, an interest in each pupil personally; he should be tender and considerate, never alienating a child by any injustice or even wounding a child by sarcasm. Let him not neglect to enforce a habit of cleanliness, decency, and delicacy, so much needed, alas! among the poor. Let him get each child to practise Christianity by good actions of all kinds. Let him get the child to know and feel the inward satisfaction of acknowledging a fault, of practising a self-denial, and the sweetness of forgiving a wrong, and of being the first to tender the kiss of reconciliation. But, not least of all, let him explain to the child the grand secret of our nature—that he cannot do these things by his own unaided strength, that he, like all human beings needs help from above. Yes, let him inculcate private prayer, and *teach* a private prayer, and find whether the child uses it night and morning, showing him how he ever needs grace for grace, χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, new grace, in place of the grace which he may have received and used.

I am not recommending anything out of the way—the being "righteous overmuch" in any direction whatever. What I advocate should all be as a matter of course in every Christian school, and not least of all in the schools of our own dear Church. I have simply urged an honest conscientiousness and walk with God as the best way to get a youth really to "know in whom he hath believed,"—to have the witness in himself," and (what is much the same) to "have the Spirit itself bearing witness with his spirit that he is the child of God." "In morals and virtue," says Aristotle, "these things which we learn in order to do them, we learn in doing and by doing." Just so in Christianity we know, on the highest authority, that it is "he who will *do* the will that shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." In a word, Christianity is not a theory but a practice.

A school thus conducted will provide the strongest safeguard for the

scholar in these trying times. In after life, when the youth is a man and mixing with his fellow-men, belief in Church authority may be shaken, flaws and cracks may be pointed out to him in the history of Christianity, the attestation of miracles and the explanation of prophecy, and the argument from design, may seem inconclusive, and bring little support to the soul; for no mere external evidences alone can now suffice, I fear, to keep a man a Christian. But your scholar,—I speak to you as school managers,—but your scholar, I say, so trained as I have faintly sketched in outline, knowing by experience the power of conscience, the truth of goodness, the efficacy of prayer, having in practice and heart "tasted and seen how gracious the Lord is," will have the best possible security that his faith will not fail at last and succumb to the subtle materialism of the day. He must have his hours of trial. Who has not? And in his dark hours it would not indeed avail him to know every biography and every date from Methusaleh to Malachi. But the New Testament which you taught him,—but the words of Christ which he learnt at your school,—may and will avail him. He will call to mind that he has a Father who seeth in secret and desires to be called upon in secret prayer. He will remember the remarkable parable of the importunate widow and the unjust judge, and he will confidently betake himself in prayer to the just Judge. And he will be able to do so because you caused him to learn prayers in your school. Or, if the words of his old prayers fail him, at least the hymns which you taught him to sing, out of the hymn-book which you gave him, must cling tenaciously in his memory, and he will cry to his Saviour,

"Abide with me, fast falls the eventide;
The darkness deepens, Lord, with me abide."

Or, in the words of that really great and good man, now, alas! lost to our Church—

"Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead Thou me on.
The night is dark, and I am far from home,
Lead Thou me on."

Surely we may trust that your scholar, so brought up and so fortified, will be able to stand in his day of trial and temptation.

Very clever men, but warped and even mutilated in mind by addiction to one line of study and thought, will tell him that conscience is merely an inbred sense of utility and expedience like the inbred quality of a pointer dog. They will tell him that all things are created by the energy inherent in matter, and the formative powers of nature, and that we are automatons, but they shall tell him all these things in vain. Your scholar shall be able to defy their most suggestive doubts and their most ingenious conjectures

"To quench his immortality
Or shake his trust in God."

Mr Hugh Birley, M.P.

Before an attempt is made to answer the question implied as the subject of the following paper, viz., The Relations of the Church to School Boards, it may be convenient to clear the ground by briefly considering the position now occupied by School Boards in the national system of administration, and the work that they have accomplished. The Elementary Education Act of 1870 was passed,—1st, To provide a sufficient supply of school buildings; 2d, To separate the religious instruction from the secular instruction, and to withdraw the former from the inspection of the Education Department.

The formation of School Boards is an expedient adopted and incorporated into the Act to supply deficiencies in school accommodation, "to supplement but not supersede" voluntary agencies, to insure the regular methodical performance of the requirement of the Act throughout the country wherever indolence or poverty had occasioned neglect. (Section 6), and to facilitate compulsory byelaws.

Although in theory School Boards are not essential to the Act, the public school accommodation in 1870 was manifestly inadequate to existing needs, and in far greater proportion below the rigid standard prescribed by the Act; so that during the debates in Parliament it was always assumed that some School Boards must of necessity be constituted.

For the formation of School Boards four initiatory methods were provided:—

1. In the metropolis a School Board is prescribed by the Act (Sect. 37);
2. In municipal boroughs on the application of the Town Council (12);
3. In other districts on the application of the ratepayers (12);
4. In districts having an insufficient supply of schools, a Board is compulsorily formed by directions from the Education Department (10).

As regards the metropolis, it seems to have been intended to remove all occasion of controversy whether a School Board should or should not be formed; as regards municipal boroughs and other districts that might apply for Boards, Mr Forster explained the views of the Government in the Committee on the Bill—

"He was aware," he said, "that it was a blot in the bill, that because a district had provided the means of education, therefore it was not to have the same power of compelling attendance as a district that had not provided the means of sufficient education. . . . After carefully considering all the difficulties of the case, the Government were prepared to take this step. While they would not force a district to provide a School Board unless it was proved deficient in school provision, they were willing to allow such districts to do so; and he proposed to introduce words to enable a School Board to be formed at once on application being made by those who, if a School Board were necessary, would elect that Board. If in a borough a Town Council wished for a School Board they would only have to apply to the Education Department for it, and there would be the same power in the rural parishes."

It will thus be seen that School Boards were a subordinate object in the Education Act, and only necessary to remedy the inadequate provision of school accommodation.

Let us now inquire what progress has been made since the Act became law in the supply of schools and the formation of School Boards.

1. The supply of elementary schools.

From the latest report of the Committee of Council the following paragraph (pp. 9, 10) is extracted.—"*School supply.*—We find that the schools in England and Wales visited by the inspectors, for the purpose of annual grants, which provided in 1869 for 1,765,944 scholars, or for 8.34 per cent. of the whole population, were in 1874 sufficient for 2,871,826 scholars, or 12.14 per cent. of the estimated population.

"An addition of room in aided schools for 1,105,882 children in five years is satisfactory, and shows that accommodation in efficient schools is increasing in much more rapid ratio than the population of the country. But much remains to be done before the three millions and a quarter of children, who ought to be daily under instruction, can be provided for in schools whose efficiency is tested by the yearly visit of one of Her Majesty's inspectors."

Note.—"In 1874 accommodation was provided by 838 Board Schools for 245,508 scholars, and 138,293 were in average attendance. The increase in the accommodation in voluntary schools since 1869 has therefore amounted to 860,374 places (or 48·7 per cent.), while the average attendance has increased by 477·467 (or 44.9 per cent)."

2. Formation of School Boards.

The next point is to ascertain what progress has been made in this branch of our inquiry.

The population of England and Wales in 1871 was—(1.) in the metropolitan district, 3,366,987 ; (2.) in 224 municipal boroughs, 6,531,892 ; (3.) in 14,082 civil parishes, 12,913,387 = 22,712,266.

1. The formation of a School Board for the metropolis was, as already stated, prescribed by the Act.

2. Boards have been established in 113 boroughs, with a population of 5,409,964 souls : "about one-half in number of boroughs, but five-sixths in number of souls."

3. Boards have been established in 1479 parishes having a population of 2,971,047 souls, less than one-ninth in number of parishes, less than one-fourth in number of souls. There appear to be no returns showing precisely the number of parishes and population governed by School Boards compulsorily formed, but the Committee of Council report that "they have issued final notices in 2718 parishes, and that these notices have resulted in the compulsory election of 476 Boards for 296 single parishes and 180 united districts. In 765 cases, the time limited by the notices has not yet expired, and in 762 cases the required accommodation has been supplied by voluntary effort."

It may be assumed, therefore, that less than two-thirds of the civil parishes now under School Boards have voluntarily availed themselves of this privilege of the Act, not exceeding one in one hundred and fifty (1 in 150).

To sum up, we find that at the present time about one-half of the population of England and Wales is under the rule of School Boards. That the urban population is mainly under that authority, but among the suburban and rural population, the system has hitherto made little progress.

It should also be observed that the above-cited figures do not disclose the proportion of Boards formed under compulsion, and Boards voluntarily formed. At first sight, generalising hastily, we may be apt to conclude that School Boards are popular in urban, but unpopular in rural districts. On closer examination, it will be remembered that in the metropolis, neither the ratepayers nor the local authorities had any choice, and that the metropolis includes more than one-fourth of the School Board population.

In municipal boroughs, the Boards have been formed on the application of the Town Councils, not on the vote of the ratepayers, and there is good reason to believe that in many boroughs the popular vote would have negatived the decision of the Councils.

This conclusion then may be drawn from the foregoing premises. School Boards are neither an essential nor a popular element in the educational system constituted by the Act of 1870.

Nevertheless, though not essential in theory, School Boards may be practically necessary to supply the admitted deficiencies in voluntary effort, and as constituted authorities exercising important national functions, it is the obvious duty of the National Church to maintain with these Boards amicable relations, and of school managers in particular to devise some *modus vivendi* to secure harmonious co-operation in the great work of elementary education.

Insisting firmly on this point, on the other hand, little sympathy need be felt with those managers of voluntary schools who, from indolence or faintheartedness, transfer their schools to the Boards.

Extreme cases may undoubtedly occur in which "the poverty but not the will consents," but even these cases might receive timely and effectual aid from a central organisation, such as the National Society, or a Diocesan Board.

The embarrassment to which many managers are subjected in providing funds for the maintenance of their schools, is by no means confined to poor parishes; it is often the reproach of the wealthiest, and springs more frequently from apathy than from poverty.

It is, however, satisfactory to state that very few voluntary schools have been transferred to School Boards under the powers of the Act.

The monthly paper of the National Society for last September, gives the following quotation from a recent parliamentary return. Of schools transferred to School Boards, 375 schools have thus been transferred, 166 connected with the Church of England, 158 connected with the British and Foreign Society, Wesleyan, &c., and 51 insufficiently described, and it significantly adds, "To the honour of the Roman Catholics it ought to be stated, that not one of their schools has been handed over to a School Board."

Excluding schools visited for inspection only, and Board Schools, the total number on the official register is 11,408. The number transferred therefore is between three and four per cent.

On the other hand, the voluntary annual contributions have increased from £397,035 in 1869 to £602,837 in 1874, an increase of more than fifty per cent., irresistible evidence of the determination of the country to maintain the voluntary system.

Having now completed this inquiry, we may proceed to consider the

vital question. Is it possible to modify the regulations of Board Schools so that they may effectively maintain religious as well as secular education?

To this question, a negative answer only can be given, so long as the ultimate decision depends neither upon fixed rules nor upon a central authority.

By statute the Boards act under great restrictions (I refer to the Cowper Temple Clause); and within their limited powers the good Resolutions of a majority to-day may be rescinded by an adverse majority to-morrow. The principal teacher may be of any creed, or of none, and the influence of his opinions, if he is indifferent or sceptical, will naturally be reflected upon the minds of the children entrusted to his care.

However much we may regret the defects of many voluntary schools in regard to religious instruction, these defects are likely to be intensified in Board Schools.

A valuable return has been laid before Parliament by the Education Department, showing the provisions made by each School Board in England and Wales for religious teaching and religious observances in Board Schools.

From this return it appears that the Board have usually issued regulations, directing instruction to be given in the Holy Scriptures. Frequently the schools are opened or closed with prayer, and sometimes also with hymns, and as regards the numerous exceptions in which no such regulations have been made, it is probable that in most instances this neglect may be attributed to the recent formation of the Boards.

It may be useful to contrast the provisions for religious instruction and observance furnished by the School Boards of Manchester and Birmingham respectively.

They may be accepted as representing the two most influential currents of public opinion on this question.

The Manchester provisions are as follows:—The School Management and Organisation Committee having carefully considered the best way of inparting religious instruction to the children under the care of the Board, in accordance with the principles of the Education Act, and of the scheme already agreed upon, beg to submit the following recommendations:—

1. That the scheme be not confined to the reading of a passage of Scripture before the whole school, with instruction thereon by the principal Schoolmaster or schoolmistress, but consist of a graduated course of teaching to be carried on by means of oral instruction, passages of Scripture committed to memory, and by suitable exercises in reading or writing.

2. That the words "by the principal teacher" be therefore omitted from sub-sec. 4. of the scheme of education, so that the assistant teachers and pupil-teachers may be able for their own sake, as well as for the children's sake, to take part in the instruction given.

3. That instruction be given to the children during each year in accordance with schedule A.

4. That having regard to the importance of religious knowledge on the part of the pupil-teachers, both for their own guidance in life, and for the sake of the scholars taught by them, as well as in respect of their future prospects in entering training-colleges, and obtaining the charge of schools, they shall receive from the principal teachers instruction in the Holy Scriptures during one and a half hours weekly in accordance with schedule B.

5. That in order to secure and encourage the religious instruction to be given in accordance with the above recommendations, an annual examination of scholars and pupil-teachers in every Board School shall be held.

6. That such examination shall take place in each school about the middle of the school year, as defined in Article 13 of the New Code.

7. That the examination shall be conducted by one or more examiners appointed by, but not being members of the Board.

8. That the examination be conducted on a day specially appointed for the purpose, should this be found to be in accordance with the Education Act.

That otherwise, the examination be conducted in the time set apart for religious instruction, during one or more days.

9. That the prayers in schedule D be adopted for use in Board Schools.

Birmingham.—The School Board makes no provision either for religious instruction or for any form of religious worship.

In buildings erected by the Board opportunity is given to voluntary teachers to give religious instruction, and to conduct any form of religious service they please.

The teachers pay rent to the Board for the use of the building.

The regulations under which the voluntary teachers have access to the schools are appended.

The Board teachers are not allowed to aid in voluntary teaching.

In school buildings held by the Board for a nominal rent, the original managers of the schools reserve in some cases the right of giving religious instruction.

Regulations for the giving of voluntary religious teaching in Board Schools.

Resolved.— That facilities should be afforded for the giving of religious instruction by voluntary agency in the school buildings belonging to the Board to children attending the Board Schools.

That in every case the wish of the parents or guardians should determine whether a child shall receive religious instruction, and whether a child shall receive any specific religious instruction that may be provided.

That any persons proposing to give religious instruction shall be required to pay to the Board a rent for the use of the buildings proportionate to the number of children to whom the religious instruction is given, and the time occupied in giving the instruction.

That the opportunity for giving the religious instruction shall be given on Tuesday morning and Friday morning in every week.

That on Tuesday and Friday mornings the schools shall be open under the management of the Board three quarters of an hour later than on other days.

That the application of the Religious Education Society, as representing a considerable number of religious communities in the town, be complied with, on the terms prescribed by these resolutions, and that the Education and School Management Committee be authorised to complete the arrangements, and report to the Board.

That any further application for the use of the school building for the giving of religious instruction in accordance with these regulations, be referred to the Education and School Management Committee for them to report to the Board, with the understanding that these applications

may be made, either—(1.) By the committee of any similar society, representing one or more of the religious communities of the town, or (2.) By ministers of religion in charge of congregations in the town, or (3.) By any person willing to give religious instruction, when the application is sustained by the signatures of the parents of at least 20 children in regular attendance at one of the departments of any Board School.

The Rev. P. Wodehouse, late inspector of the Manchester Diocesan Board of Education, observes in his Report, dated last July :—"Few things strike me more than the very small amount of distinctive Church teaching which is given in Church schools;" and he adds, "From this it follows, nor have I any hesitation in making the inference, that if the excellent scheme of religious instruction drawn up by the School Board of Manchester for use in their schools is honestly carried out, the children educated in the Manchester Board Schools will know quite as much of the Catechism as the children in half the Church schools of the diocese."

Assuming that School Boards will continue to exist, it is clearly of the highest importance that the members should be carefully selected. It is often argued, with great force, that their title to support should not be adherence to this or that political party, whether secularist or religious, but experience and ability in education, administrative talents and practical common sense; yet so long as the Boards are invested with extensive power in withholding or permitting religious instruction, it is difficult to understand how party contests can be avoided.

Scotland, in this respect more fortunate than England, retains her old custom of religious instruction by express enactment, free from the uncertain and capricious action of School Board regulations.

Undoubtedly the present system of election has not proved altogether satisfactory, and practical men of all parties are beginning to demand an amendment of the Act, so that power may be given to the Boards under proper regulations, to supply casual vacancies, without resorting to a poll of the constituency. Even now, whilst School Boards have the attraction of novelty, it is difficult to induce the most competent men to undergo the annoyances of a contest.

But whilst all thinking minds seem to converge to one conclusion, when dealing with the evils of School Board elections, opinions differ materially as to the remedy. By some it is held that we ought to fix a wider area than the parish, and taking advantage of the provision of the Act for United School Districts, make the School Board District co-extensive with the Union. It has been argued that "the selection of representatives from this wider circle would perhaps insure the services of men of greater ability and position, who would put an end to local jealousies and local recklessness in the imposition of rates."

But parishes, already amply supplied with efficient voluntary schools, would of course resist this enforced and ill-assorted union, which, indeed, would be contrary to the spirit, if not to the letter of the Education Act, and there are educationists ready to maintain that the proposal to form extensive districts is quite a mistake. The secretary of the Salisbury Diocesan Board, in his letter to the Bishop of Manchester, insists that though the larger area would give the larger choice of men, it would not give the most choice men. This is a neat epigrammatic way of condensing his argument, but its soundness is questionable. Here is his imaginary

School Board in "a benighted country village:"—"The squire or some representative of the landed proprietors, the clergyman, a farmer. These three would occur to every one. Two more are wanted. If Dissent be prevalent in the parish, a representative of that interest would be the fourth; the rector would propose him. An intelligent labouring man, having children in the school, would complete the list."

No doubt these are excellent materials, and with mutual forbearance, a Board so constituted might satisfactorily conduct the education of the parish. If, however, the squire or the clergyman be rejected in favour of a candidate not upon this list, or if the religious question should become the frequent subject of debate, less harmonious results might safely be predicted.

Mr Routledge, school inspector, observes (p. 142), "It cannot be too deeply impressed on theoretical educationists that it is almost impossible in small country parishes to get together even five people who are at once competent and willing to superintend the process of education. Some members of a Board are frequently less highly educated than the schoolmaster, and surrender themselves blindly to his dictation and judgment. My colleague, Mr Temple, has quite expressed my own sentiments, when he speaks of the evil inflicted on schools by the absence of that personal help which is given by voluntary committees, but which is often overlooked or neglected by the members of School Boards, composed of farmers or men of business who have no time to spare, and only a very secondary interest in, and a very slight knowledge of, the details of instruction."

If we now compare and contrast the respective strength and vitality of Board and voluntary schools, an impartial review must surely award the palm of superiority to the latter.

At first sight, it may be supposed that in secular learning the Board Schools must have an indisputable advantage, as the Board can command resources beyond the means of private persons. But this advantage is apparent, rather than real.

Profuse expenditure will not insure good schools, and the British ratepayer will become very impatient under the burthen. Voluntary managers, if they are prudent and in earnest, will look closely into details, be ready to encourage the teachers in their work, offer their sympathy and aid in time of trouble, have a kindly word for the parents of the children and the children themselves, and thus secure a legitimate influence practically beyond the reach of a Board with its rigid and mechanical action, its bye-laws and routine.

In every other respect a parish enjoying the ministrations of a faithful and intelligent pastor must almost inevitably suffer by the transfer of a school to a Board.

The religious training of the young is of course the foremost question; upon this familiar topic further comments are surely superfluous; but there are other points of important though minor consideration.

If the parish clergyman has not free access to the school, his means of usefulness are seriously impaired. For the Sunday school, for Confirmation classes, and a variety of parochial institutions, such a building is essential. It is to be feared, that if admitted only on sufferance and at stated hours, the visits of the clergyman, perhaps not now too frequent, would become rare indeed, and some trifling dispute might close the doors against him.

After all, the only safe, the only just, reliance that voluntary schools can entertain, is summed up in the word "efficiency." Apart from this practical test, all appeals to exertions and sacrifices in the past will fall idly upon the ears of the public at large.

Whatever credit managers may claim and receive on these grounds, will not be allowed to supersede the demand for efficient education in its widest sense, and it is to be regretted that many influential persons lend force to the arguments of those who systematically disparage voluntary schools, when they declare that under the existing competition with Board Schools, the former must gradually dwindle and perish.

Undoubtedly, the compulsory payment of rates to maintain Board Schools by those who tax themselves heavily to maintain efficient voluntary schools is a real grievance, and it is not surprising that there should be a great and growing demand for a system, analogous to that of Canada, whereby the ratepayer can assign his rate to the class of schools which he prefers.

The adoption of this system would probably tend to the discontinuance of many Board Schools, as provided by the 18th section of the Act, and in effect restrict the duties of the Board to the enforcement of bye-laws and the distribution of the school-rate.

It remains for the advocates of the plan to show how it can be worked in practice, as it would inevitably be more complicated in this country than in Canada.

Another problem awaits solution to which I can only incidentally refer, and that is the constitution or selection of some local authority, armed with power to frame and adopt bye-laws under the Education Department, for the purpose of enforcing attendance at school, without resorting to the cumbrous machinery or the initiating contest of School Boards.

The present aspect of affairs, though not without cause for anxiety, is, on the whole, calculated to encourage and stimulate all who are engaged in the noble work of national education.

With energy, perseverance, and union, the difficulties which beset the path may speedily be overcome, and a solid basis of combined religious and secular instruction may be laid, penetrating to the lowest and most neglected ranks of society, so that the desire of many hearts may at length be fulfilled, and a sound elementary education may be brought within the reach of every English child.

The Rev. E. Jackson, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St James's Church, Leeds, and Honorary Canon of Ripon.

That I have been requested to read a paper on the important subject to which this meeting of the Congress is devoted, is, I conceive, owing to the fact of my having been long practically connected with public elementary education, and to the additional fact of my occupying a seat on the School Board of the borough of Leeds; a School Board, which by very high authority has been pronounced one of the most successful in the kingdom.

It is from this particular stand-point of the public elementary educational provision of Leeds, as supplied by the School Board, and by other bodies, that I would consider the subject assigned to me.

*

In doing this, I will first offer such carefully-prepared statistical information as I have been able to procure, and then from such statement of facts proceed to draw some, at least in my judgment, important conclusions.

The first of these facts, to which I would invite the attention of my auditory is this, that in the ten years from 1860 to 1870, the whole of the *additional* public elementary school accommodation, provided by the Church of England, and other religious bodies, in Leeds, did little more than meet the need for such additional accommodation for *one* of those ten years, and further, that a considerable part of that additional school accommodation was of a temporary and unsatisfactory character.

Let me next point out what was the exact state of public elementary education in Leeds, as shown by a return made by order of the House of Commons, in the year 1869, the year before the passing of the Education Act.

	On Roll.	Average Attendance.
Church of England	15,361	9,626
Other Religious Bodies	6,218	3,988
Total .	21,579	13,614

The Leeds School Board was elected at the end of 1870, but it was not until the beginning of 1872 that any schools were opened, the intervening time being occupied with preliminary inquiries and correspondence with the Education Department in London. The Board, therefore, in July last had really been in active operation only three years and a half. At that date the following was the return of Board Schools :—

On Roll.	Average Attendance.
18,603	11,847

While the ascertained numbers in schools belonging to the religious bodies were :—

	On Roll.	Average Attendance.
Church of England	19,942	12,556
Other Religious Bodies	7,658	4,611
Total .	27,600	17,167

These figures show the very remarkable result, that after the three years and a half of the School Board's practical operations, 18,603 children were on the roll on Board Schools, while the children in the schools of the Church of England and other religious bodies actually exceeded by 6021 the number on the roll, when the School Board began to work, while the total increase on the roll has been 104 per cent. Very striking as this result is, it is readily accounted for ; the employment of special officers to look after the attendance of children at school, and the putting in force the provision for compulsory attendance, explain this extraordinary difference in the aggregate number of children at school. From the commencement of the operation of the bye-laws for enforcing attendance, nearly 7000 notices have been sent to parents whose children were absent from school, and 436 prosecutions before the

magistrate instituted, followed by the infliction of a fine varying from one to five shillings. It is proper to note, that in all cases, before even the notices are sent from the Board, the attendance officers have visited the parties in fault, and sought to persuade them to send their children to school, so as to avoid the necessity of legal proceedings, and also that before the case actually takes the form of a summons before the magistrate, the parent has the opportunity of appearing before a committee of the School Board, and of stating anything in explanation or mitigation of the case.

And here a few words should be given to the vexed question (how needlessly a vexed question the Leeds experience makes clearly to appear) of the famous 25th clause of the Education Act. It may then be emphatically stated, that in Leeds no difficulty whatever has been found in carrying out that provision of the Act. On the contrary, it is the decided conviction of the most active members and officers of the Board, that without the 25th clause, it would have been simply impossible to have worked the compulsory bye-laws, and thus have attained the valuable results which compulsory attendance has secured. Whenever a parent can show to the satisfaction of the committee of the Board, whose duty it is to consider such cases, that there is real indigence, that the child is kept away from an inability to pay the school fees, tickets for free attendance are invariably given, the Board paying the fees at other schools, remitting them at their own; freedom being allowed to the parent in the choice of the school to which his child shall be sent.

Whilst thus the Leeds School Board uses its utmost diligence to enforce attendance, there is everything done to attract children to school, and to make the parents place a higher value upon the education of their children. The Board has twenty-six evening schools, with nearly 2000 scholars; 1800 scholars passed the examination of the science and art department; the Kindergarten system for infant schools is being introduced, and swimming is taught weekly to the elder boys.

Lessons on physiology and the laws of health, so valuable that they have recently been published and elicited warm and general approbation, have been delivered before the more advanced scholars; while a system of rewards, including illuminated cards and books, for good attendance has been commenced, which promises the best results.

The Board now has no fewer than ninety-seven head teachers, seventy-two assistant teachers, and 403 pupil-teachers in its employ; but this number, though appearing so large, will have to be continually increased.

The population of the borough of Leeds is computed to be at the present time upwards of 280,000,—for which the adequate public elementary school provision would be about 52,000;—the total existing accommodation is, however, but 47,000,—showing a deficiency of 5000,—while the annual increase of the population calls for additional elementary school provision for 1000 children, at a cost of say from £7000 to £8000 in school sites, buildings, and apparatus, and of at least £500 a year in maintenance, exclu sive of children's payments and Government grants.

In all the Leeds Board Schools, the Bible is required to be read with singing and prayer. And here again no difficulty has been found; the conscience clause is respected in all cases, where its protection is claimed. Whether or not the Bible teaching in the schools, and still more the

religious instruction of the pupil-teachers, is all that could be desired is a very pertinent and very weighty question, and one in close connection with some of the conclusions, which, from the facts I have given, I will now proceed to draw.

1. I deduce, that previous to the Education Act of 1870, notwithstanding the large efforts made by the religious bodies, notably by the Church of England, there was very extensive and rapidly increasing need for further provision of public elementary education.

2. That there was no probability, it might be said, indeed, no possibility, of such enlarged provision being supplied by the religious bodies.

3. That the Act of 1870 has been proved to be an eminently practical, just, and beneficent measure, reflecting the highest credit for wisdom and public spirit on its authors, and entitling the government which passed it to the enduring gratitude of the country.

4. That instead of being injurious to the Church, the Education Act by the provision for compulsory attendance, as well also as by the better feeling it has excited on behalf of elementary education, has greatly added to the number of children in Church of England schools.

5. That the further and continued effect of the Act in raising generally the intellectual condition of the great masses of the population, ought to be of the greatest service to religion, by preparing a more suitable element for receiving its influences and appeals; seeing that the Church has everything to gain by the awakening of mind, and the quickening of the intellectual powers.

6. That, therefore, it is obviously the duty and policy of the Church cordially to accept, and actively to co-operate in the carrying out, a measure which, apart from all other considerations, may now be deemed to be as much a part of our national economy as the Poor Law Relief itself.

7. That it is most important, however, to realise the fact, that the Education Act in its provisions, and in its working, has greatly increased the duties and the responsibilities of the clergy.

8. That the training of teachers for elementary schools is now more than ever a matter of vital importance. The demand is great, and will continue to be great, and the Church ought to be prepared to meet that demand with as large a supply as possible of highly-trained men and women :—teachers of great intellectual ability and culture, and of equally earnest religious character;—ready to enter both Board schools and Church schools.

9. That the care of the young has become an emphatic duty. Catechising should be regularly and carefully practised. The Sunday-school system should be extended, and also greatly improved, and all other modes for securing the attachment, and promoting the religious training of children, should be sought out and adopted. Separate Bible classes for young people will be greatly needed.

10. That teachers in elementary schools, whether Church schools or Board schools, should have the importance of their position recognised, and no members of our congregations, or residents in our parishes, should have more of the kindly notice and appreciative sympathy of Churchmen, —especially of the clergy.

11. That this kindly notice, with affectionate pastoral care and aid,

should especially be extended to the vast body of pupil-teachers,—and especially to those in Board Schools, the Church seeking to supply, in right and wise methods, with that more distinctive religious teaching, those, who from the peculiar nature of their position will more urgently require it.

12. And it is a question, though I know that here I am treading on very delicate ground, whether in certain cases it might not be a clear gain and great relief to the Church to transfer, upon proper and safe conditions, to School Boards, such Church Schools as, from continued and hopeless deficiency of voluntary support, may be both burdensome and unavoidably inefficient. For myself I think that transfer can only be a matter of time in the case of schools thus situated.

In conclusion, I am not unmindful that the deductions I have now been making are based upon the educational condition of a limited area, and it may be said, that wider observation and knowledge of the working of School Boards might not support these views. I am quite willing to bear this test, fully believing that further inquiry will not materially shake my conclusion, if that inquiry be accurately and impartially made.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. Canon Melville.

My theme is religious teaching in Board Schools, and the Church's duty therein to that great and growing element of the national system. But first, with regard to that desire to recall the original draft of the Education Act, and to repeal the Cowper-Temple Clause, which now-a-days is so frequently heard of. There are two cries in which the practical mind of England is unwilling to indulge. One is the cry over spilt milk, and the other is the cry for the moon. Now, to lament the first draft of the Education Act of 1870, which left the kind and degree of religious teaching, if any, to each School Board to determine for itself, were very like crying over spilt milk; and to clamour for the repeal of the Cowper-Temple Clause is, I fear, very like crying for the moon. The Church, through its authorised voices, did little or nothing at the time to secure the one or arrest the other; and now the duty of the Church to that Act it accepted, and has put itself forward to administer, is, by its collective opinion and force, as here at this time—its educational organisations and machinery, and the individual efforts of its representatives on School Boards, to save the mere religious permissiveness of the Act from sinking to that zero to which apathy, ignorance, and dislike have already partly committed it, and still more may commit it, and to register the highest standard of systematic teaching of which the enactment admits. For do not let us delude ourselves; to repeal the Cowper-Temple Clause is not necessarily to bring back the original provision of the Act, much less to substitute for it, as some would fondly dream, the Church Catechism in its integrity; but rather it would at best leave the point as a bone of rabid contention, wherein the bitterness of sectarian strife would eventuate more often than not in a stern and determined secularism. For the Legislature rarely, if ever, walks backwards, not even though the previous step may have been weak—rash—dangerous; and certainly the country, as well as the Parliament, before it consents to even contemplate the question of repeal, would

require that the Church, in asking it, should show that it had exhausted its thought, its energy, and its experience in making the best use it could of the means for religious teaching which the Act supplies. If after such experiment, faithfully, intelligently, anxiously made, nothing like a sound, systematic teaching could possibly be extracted, then the Church might have a case and appear in Court. If it cannot *in limine* produce this affidavit, depend upon it the Court of Appeal would at once reject the suit. The reader of the first paper referred to the materialism of Aristotle, but I would say :—It was a wise old Greek who said—"He was the best shoemaker—not who could make the best theoretical pair of shoes, but who could make the best pair of shoes out of the leather supplied to him." Now, let us think whether the Church in this matter has at all acted on this wise maxim, and, if not, whether the materials supplied are or can be made adequate to the work required; and then, what are the great interests involved which, if the materials are or can be made adequate, make it incumbent on the Church to use rather than reject them. Now, the pair of shoes to be made is a "sufficient, efficient, and suitable" basis for religious instruction in Board Schools—for we start with this postulate—that religion, like any other subject to be taught, requires a systematic and formulated process, and cannot be left to the caprice or indifference of individual will; and the material supplied for this work is measured by the Cowper-Temple Clause, which limits it to that which is not "distinctive of any particular denomination." Anything else may be used, be it creed or formulary. This is most necessary to be borne in mind, for it is very commonly totally misunderstood. That is, as I have always maintained, and still would maintain, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Apostles' Creed, for instance, may be taught—for the exception expressed by the clause does not touch them. They mark and distinguish no separate denomination. No one sect, denomination, or church would presume to exclusively claim them as its own. No aggregate of sects, denominations, or churches, would dare to exclusively assign the prestige and power of their possession to any single other sect or church. The Act means that as you cannot outwardly affix to the forefront of a Board School any particular designation, so you cannot teach within what would mark it as distinctively particular. But this basis has no such distinctive particularity. This is clear, of course, as to the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments—being parts of Holy Writ, but is no less true, for the reason I have just given, of the Apostles' Creed—and thus out of the leather supplied the pair of shoes can be made "sufficient," for it is enough on which securely to base the infant faith and hope, and to meet the requirements of true Churchmen as identical with the educational basis our baptismal formulary lays down: "Efficient," for thereby the two great requirements in religious teaching—methodical arrangement and personal interest—may be secured; and "suitable"—whether you regard the age, character, and intelligence of those taught, the relation of the religious to the other elements of instruction, or the responsibility of the Church in the matter of popular education. The question—the only question—that can arise would be—"Is such a basis within the letter and spirit of the clause?" There can be no doubt about the latter. That formulary is alone excluded which distinctly and singly marks off any one separate denomination—not that which is common equally to two or more, and conveys no such distinctive designation. But I happily am saved general argument on this point by a direct and pertinent fact. Nor will I say anything, though much might be urged about the intention of the framer of the clause or the legislative body, for though the great moralist tells us "intentions are acts," he did not mean that to include Acts of Parliament. The

basis is in existence in School Boards, and has been passed by the Education Department. Lately, I carefully have gone through the return moved for in Parliament last session as to the religious teaching in School Board schools. The whole return is most interesting and instructive. It establishes most determinately the national desire for religious education, and expresses a decided, if not always an articulate. desire for something firmer and clearer than mere Bible reading and teaching. Throughout Wales the feeling for some fixed basis is conveyed by adding the Lord's Prayer to Bible instruction. Often there, and more often in England, the Ten Commandments are added, and in two places, the town of Cockermouth and Warmington in Northamptonshire, the full basis of the Lord's Prayer, Ten Commandments, and Apostles' Creed was resolved upon on the construction of the Boards, on which there are Nonconformist members. At Cockermouth the Wesleyan minister seconded the resolution—and on the resolution being submitted by the Cockermouth Board to the Education Department, it did not declare the basis inconsistent with the requirements of the Cowper-Temple Clause, and it has since been acted upon, and only some Roman Catholic children, none other, have ever been withdrawn from the religious instruction of the school. Now it is the practical attitude of men's minds that nowadays promptly decides public opinion and determines momentous issues. That course or policy will best secure this influence that catches in any subject the element of pure light which is common to the varieties of thought and feeling in the body at large. It is this which I am anxious the Church in this most momentous matter should assume. I would ask Churchmen, alive to the value of education, to give a firm yet simple basis to the national system, and thereby to rescue the mere permission of the Act from its present uncertainty. I would ask those who reverence Bible teaching to evince that reverence by securing that the facts of truth may not wither and drop off, but be converted into elements of living faith, which, besides the literary and educational value of the Bible, is its singular and especial province. I would ask those who fear a denominational or sectarian interpretation to take the best security against this by a comprehensive, whilst positive, outline—for the freedom of individual teaching is no guarantee, quite the reverse, against this danger. I would ask the Church to prove that its claim of all as belonging to itself, who do not determinately attach themselves elsewhere, is no mere titular claim, but that it is anxious to make the claim a reality in the only possible way for the community at large. And I would ask Nonconformists to regard this claim and its proof with only a godly jealousy, and not as of the rivalry of sects, with strife and bitterness. And I ask this of each and all—that the future of our country, certainly so critical, may offer the best earnest for the personal, social, and political well-being of its people. For who can measure the blessings which might result, or the evils that might be stayed, through a sincere common effort to elevate the national schoolroom by a simple yet sound system of divine truth? To promote the union of the rising and future generations in "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," as simply taught in the great prayer, and precepts, and creed of Christendom, must at least act back with the blessing of Christian unity on those who plant God's truth on such a pillar and ground. It is no matter of Church proselytism, I am not thinking of the possible increase of the Church's strength and glory, though the Church, if, like the Grecian mother of old, she bares the fountain of love and life to her child in his moment of danger, may win back her wandering children once more to her arms.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. W. Cadman, M.A.

There are one or two particulars in connection with this subject upon which I desire to bear my testimony. The whole matter comes before us at the present time in connection with the question of the School Boards. Now, I hope that we shall, none of us, feel it necessary to take an antagonistic position to the School Boards, but I think it is of great importance, on the other hand, that no clergyman should think of giving up his schools to the action of the School Board until he is positively compelled to do so. It seems to me, that as Churchmen this is a matter of most vital importance. The necessity is laid upon us to provide in every possible way that we can, that there should be not only religious education at present, but that it should be permanently continued in all these institutions with which we have to do. A solemn inheritance has been handed down to us by our forefathers, and that inheritance should be handed down, unimpaired, to those who come after us. I, for one, can never forget that when we are privileged, as clergymen, to introduce children into the visible membership of Christ's Church, there is a charge which we are commanded to give, that those children be taken care of, and brought up in such a way as to remember always what their baptism signifies. I cannot see how this can be done if we imperil the continuance of religious instruction in our schools. It may be very well during the present arrangement, during one good election of members of the School Board, that religious instruction may be provided, but as far as I can see, another election may change the whole situation as to the School Board, and imperil that principle which we are bound to maintain. I therefore trust that we shall all feel bound to maintain the Voluntary Schools as long as we possibly can. There is another matter upon which I desire to say a word, namely, the duty of clergymen in connection with pupil-teachers of schools. It is a very sad reflection that from the report of Her Majesty's Inspectors, it would appear that there is not that attention paid to the religious instruction of pupil-teachers which might justly be expected. I trust that this warning will be received in such a way, that henceforth every one of us will feel that one of his primary duties in connection with these schools is to teach those who have to teach the children. We have very great advantages in such opportunity. Who is so open to kindness and to little marks of attention as the youths, the boys and girls who occupy the position of pupil-teachers? Let us ask them to our houses and invite them to a little entertainment sometimes. This is the way to get their affection and to make them listen to our instructions, not as a matter of duty, but as a matter of delight. I trust that the clergyman teaching his pupil-teachers will become as universal and common a practice as the clergyman conducting the service on the Sabbath-day in his church. Then in reference to another matter. If there be one point more than another in the admirable paper which has been read which I thought important, it was that we should desire conscientiousness in our teachers rather than a high scale of literary attainments. Sure I am that we need to pay great attention to this point, and I speak now from the experience of a metropolitan population, and from the experience which I have had in connection with the action of Ragged Schools, and my conclusions are just these. Although Ragged Schools have been voted to be inefficient, because of the teachers not being able to pass such an examination as would gain a certificate, yet, generally speaking, the teachers of our Ragged Schools were Christian men and women constrained to their work by an overcoming mastering passion, if I may so describe it, of love for the heavenly Master and love for souls for His sake. This led them to be kind to the children, to look after them out of school, and to bring such a power of Christian love to bear upon them that the destitute ones of the street were attracted to the school, and looked upon it as a place in which they would rather be present than absent. Cases have arisen, over and over again, in which boys and girls, having grown up to men and women, have come back to their old teachers, first of all, considering

the school in which they have been taught as their home. I fear that these influences of Christian love may be somewhat less in connection with a more efficient system of secular instruction, but let this be attended to by our Christian teachers, let them seek that this power of attractiveness by Christian love, be brought to bear in our schools, and then I am sure that we shall all have reason to rejoice. As to the School Board, I have found, their officers willing to work in co-operation with the Voluntary Schools in my neighbourhood, and therefore it is that I said at first, that I should very much deprecate any opposition to the School Board. Let us try to co-operate with them when we can. Let us receive the children which their officers may send to us, provide some fund, by which not to lower the school fees, but to pay the deficiency between the penny a week, perhaps, which I think the parents ought in all cases to subscribe, and the regular fee, and thus to get the whole of our schools filled with those who may be brought under the power of those great truths which we believe to be necessary for their present and eternal good. Let us co-operate with School Boards, and if we cannot do all the good we can wish, let us do all the good we can.

Mr Christopher Bushell, late Chairman of the Liverpool School Board.

The question upon which I desire to say a few words is thus put upon the paper:—"The Church and the School Boards." It is somewhat vaguely put, and perhaps wisely so, in order that each speaker may address himself to the question from his own point of view. The inquiry which I desire to bring before the Congress is simply this:—In what spirit should the Church of England regard the work of School Boards? Now, personally, I am strongly under the impression that School Boards are a necessity rather than a choice. In the metropolis and in our densely-crowded towns, in which the increase of population had far outstripped any efforts that the voluntary principle could possibly make for the education of the people, School Boards have become an absolute necessity. This is the age of great cities, and in them, and with their wants, no voluntary system could now be sufficient for the need. The Church of England, after all that it has so nobly done in this great work of education, has found, nevertheless, that very much beyond its power remains to be accomplished. After long and anxious consideration had been given to this question by Parliament, the country received at the hands of Mr Forster, a statesman to whom all honour is due, and to whose high character and great ability all reverence should be paid—the Elementary Education Act of 1870.

By that Act, the principle of local rating for elementary education was adopted. Seeing that the rates so levied would be contributed by all the various religious denominations, the education to be given in rate-supported schools, must of necessity, if not secular, at least be undenominational. The Act moreover conferred permissive power for the giving religious instruction in Board Schools, provided that no formulary or catechism should be used distinctive of the creed of any particular denomination. Happily, as might have been supposed, the people at large, and School Boards in general, have adopted the principle, that the Bible, and the religious instruction which alone can be derived from it, shall be the basis of all elementary education, whether given in Board or Voluntary Schools. Unhappily, for a long time, sectarian differences, or, as they were delicately called, "religious difficulties," prevented legislation upon this subject, and so year after year multitudes of children were brought up in ignorance, and many perished soul and body, as it were, in our streets. Let us therefore rejoice that we have in supplement to, and not in suspension of, the Voluntary Schools, those of the School Board, and that in most of them there is given, speaking from my own experience, what I believe to be as sound religious instruction as it is possible to give with the limitation

to which I have previously referred. I am one of those who sincerely think that the two systems of School Board and Voluntary Schools will greatly help each other, and who therefore earnestly desire that they should be encouraged to go on in honourable rivalry together, believing that the general cause of elementary education will be best promoted by these joint means. Let us then, who are not only members of the Church of England, but also to His Church, who has commanded us to feed His lambs,—resolve that we will not look upon the action of School Boards in an antagonistic spirit, but, if it be possible, by becoming members of such Boards, share with them this work. At least let us sympathise with workers who are as earnest as ourselves, and receive with thankfulness the valuable help which they have already given, and which it may be hoped they will continue to give, on the promotion of the religious and moral instruction of the masses of our people. I need hardly point to the statistics of our Criminal Courts, to the prevailing drunkenness and its attendant poverty and misery, to show that an almost heathen ignorance in our very midst is the prolific parent of those national and social evils which we so deeply deplore. We ought not therefore to regard with disfavour, much less to dare to oppose, any means of education which are likely to help in banishing that ignorance which is at the very root of those evils which are a fearful blot upon our national character. The unparalleled prosperity with which this country has been blessed by Providence during the last few years, and which ought to have tended greatly to promote the increase of the home comforts and happiness of the masses of our people, to have helped the education of their children, and the improvement of their dwellings,—has by its gross misuse proved to have been a curse rather than a blessing. Now, the practical suggestion which I desire to make is this. I would earnestly urge in the best interests of the great cause of elementary education, not less than in the interests of our National Church, that no Church of England school shall ever be given over to a School Board, so long as it is possible otherwise to maintain them in thorough efficiency. In this respect, the Roman Catholics set us a noble example. They as yet have not, and I feel persuaded will not ever part with one of their schools. They know that their schools are the nurseries, the recruiting ground, as it were, of their Church; and that in them alone can their distinctive and dogmatic religious teaching be given. Let us, who differ so essentially from them upon many vital points, at least imitate their wisdom and zeal in this particular. If we value the privilege, and desire to retain the blessings which we believe belong to our National Church, it needs no argument to prove that we must, of necessity, maintain in vigour and efficiency our Church of England schools. I should be sorry to share Canon Jackson's fear that there ever will be a pecuniary necessity for parting with any of our schools. Let our bishops, who are at the head of our Diocesan Boards, frame some organisation, including the appointment of a committee, which shall have for its special duty the supervision of the whole Church of England school system of the diocese, excluding, perhaps, the large towns which might very well be called upon to fulfil that duty for themselves. The report of the diocesan inspector of religious instruction, and his personal knowledge of each individual school, would be most valuable aid and help n such supervision. Let Diocesan Boards also become responsible for raising the needful funds and for the distribution among the schools of poor districts such measure of help as they may require for their maintenance in thorough efficiency. I believe if the wealthy laity of the Church of England had the case clearly put before them, and were earnestly called upon by the bishops to fulfil their duty in this particular, that the needful funds would be abundantly forthcoming, and that our Church of England schools in town and country, throughout the whole length and breadth of the land, would not only be able to hold their ground, but to continue to maintain that lead which they have hitherto taken in the education of the masses of the people. Sir Wilfred Lawson yesterday showed us what faith can do. He most energetically pursues what some people may think a shadow. His powerful, zealous, and most laudable advocacy of the "Permissive Bill" are the result of an enduring faith that sound prin-

ciples are embodied in that proposed measure, and that great benefits would result to the community from its enactment. We have grounds for a more vital faith than his. Sir Wilfred's remedy for the great evil of drunkenness, being of man's device, *may* be fallible. For our remedy against drunkenness, debauchery and crime, the only one in which I am able to believe—that of a sound religious education—we have on our side the glorious and infallible promise, that if we "train up a child in the way he should go, when he is old he will not depart from it."

The Rev. Canon Money.

I BELIEVE we all feel that this is a subject into which no bitterness, no prejudice, and no fanciful or impracticable theory should enter. The Act of 1870 was passed, it has been said, to supplement, and not to overthrow, voluntary schools. That was a pledge by which I believe, the Educational Department will abide; it is a pledge which, I believe, the people in this country will require to be strictly carried out. What is the duty of Churchmen in regard to that Act? It is to accept it loyally, and to help to carry it out with all the energy which they possess. It has been very truly said to-day that it is most important that you should take care in the selection of your masters and mistresses. If that be the case, how important is it that Churchmen should take care to place right men upon the School Boards. I do not believe that we have any reason to fear that our denominational schools will be overthrown. In my neighbourhood, in Greenwich, we have taken our part in carrying out this Act as managers of denominational schools, as Poor-law Guardians, and as managers of the School Board. What has been the result? It has been said that School Boards have the rates at their backs; but what, I ask, have the denominational schools in this country at their back? They have a strong deep religious feeling, which is increasing and strengthening, and this has been evidenced by the increase of subscriptions which have been pouring into the treasury of our voluntary schools. Do not, then, let us hear of handing over these schools to the School Board; rather let us see that, remembering that the voluntary schools are on their trial, there is greater efficiency in every department, especially with regard to religious education. I wish to say one word with reference to pupil-teachers. I was preaching last night in a neighbouring church here against cruelty to animals, and I want to put in a plea especially for female pupil-teachers. I wish to urge at this time, when there is so great an anxiety to raise the standard of our schools, that they may not be overpressed; if so, the consequence will be terrible; they will become physically, morally, and mentally overpowered, and these are to be the future mistresses of our schools. With regard to their religious training, in the diocese of Rochester there is a special examination in religious knowledge for pupil-teachers—an examination carried out with the greatest care and the greatest success. This examination has been held, for one part, in my own schools, and I can speak to the interest taken by the pupil-teachers themselves in it, and especially to the gratification with which they receive the prizes awarded to them. It has been already well said to-day that we are not merely to cram, but we are to train up those who are to be the future masters and mistresses of our schools. How is this to be done? In the first place, if you have a religious master and mistress, their example as well as their teaching will help you; but if you have not, how much more important is it that the clergy and managers of the schools should themselves look to the formation of the character of these pupil-teachers. We must follow them, as it has been said, to their homes, see the books which they have there, see the house library formed; and remember that our connection with them does not cease when the school is over, but that by personal influence, by advice, by sympathy in their many difficulties and trials, we may hope to train those whose duty it will be to train others. Let us go away remembering that a mighty responsibility rests upon us in regard to this subject, to train those who shall be the hereafter fathers and mothers, or masters and mistresses, of the people of this great country.

Mr Holmes.

As I have been a manager for voluntary schools for thirty-nine years, and also a manager of a School Board for five years, I have thought it right to say a few words; and after the excellent speeches which we have heard, I shall confine myself to a few remarks upon matters which have come under my own observation. I would first remark, that long before the Education Act came out in 1870, national education was really an established fact in this country. More than thirty years ago we had several excellent schools in the parish in which I live; and as the tree is known by its fruits, I may add that some gentlemen now occupying high social positions were educated in our national schools. I would also make a remark about the importance of early religious education. I was glad that it was remarked upon by the second speaker to-day, because I think it is very much overlooked by many of us. About thirty-five years ago, in a Sunday-school of which I was appointed superintendent, I established an infant class, which I found very beneficial; it was not only a feeder to the boys' school, but taking the children at four years old, they become afterwards some of the most zealous and best attendants, and many of them developed into excellent teachers. Some few years ago I was going out of one of our schools at about half-past nine in the morning, when I met a woman bringing her grandchildren to school: she told me that she herself had received the little education she had in that infant school; it is now a girls' school, but we have an infant school attached to it. She told me that she had left school when she was six years old, but she could then repeat, although she was nearly seventy, the hymns, texts of Scripture, Psalms, which she had then learned; and she told me what a consolation and comfort in times of sickness it had been to her that she had had this early training and religious instruction. She repeated to me two beautiful hymns, suitable for children, and also the twenty-third psalm. I asked her to do so, and she did it at once very readily. I have had the satisfaction, during the thirty-nine years that I have been superintendent of the school and member of the committee, of receiving many children of those who had themselves been pupils in the schools. I have had two generations of them, and I can therefore bear testimony to the great importance of early sound religious education. I do hope that steps will be taken to induce the Government to grant some portion of the rates to existing voluntary schools. I was in the very painful position two years ago of being obliged to transfer our boys' school to the School Board. I did not do this until, as honorary treasurer, I advanced more than £400, but I made it a condition that we should have the use of the school on two evenings in the week and the whole of Sunday, and that we could claim it back again by giving twelve months' notice.

The Rev. Canon Barry.

It is a commonplace remark that the present is a very critical time for voluntary schools. I believe it is also an exceedingly critical time for the rival Board system. There is at the present moment a slight reaction against the educational enthusiasm of a few years ago. People are disappointed that the Boards have not done everything which was educationally needed, and they are beginning to be not a little frightened at the long bill which some School Boards have had to present. Under these circumstances, the School Board system is in a critical position, and the question is, What shall the Church do towards it? There is one thing which I trust the Church will not do—that she will not lend herself in any degree to anti-educational reaction—that she will not, under any circumstances, seek what I may call a base and hardly honest alliance with the advocates of economy at any price. What I trust she will do is to come forward, as she has done in days past in all great educational crises, and show that the strong hand of the State is not sufficient to sur-

mount them without that higher and more spiritual influence which the Church has wielded and can wield again. First, there are many great questions before us, to one of which especially I have been rather surprised to hear no allusion to-day—that is, the necessity of providing some machinery of universal educational compulsion, not necessarily through the medium of the School Boards. I hope that the advocates of the Board system, and we who are supporters of the old Church system also, will work hand in hand to surmount these serious obstacles to educational success. Next, with regard to School Boards at this time, I hope that we shall use them as far as we can; that we shall watch them vigilantly to see that they do not step beyond that place which the Education Act of 1870 assigns them; and that, as has been well said to-day, by putting upon them right and true men we shall try to rule them. I believe that the Church of England still has power to rule, and it would be fatal policy to surrender the School Board system—an accomplished fact which no man can possibly overthrow—into other and less trustworthy hands. But while I hope this, I also sincerely trust that the advice which was somewhat timidly given by my friend Mr Jackson to-day will not be acted upon, and that the Church will not surrender one single school that she can keep. I hear on all sides gloomy forebodings as to the future of voluntary schools; I do not altogether share them. The experience of some six years of the School Board system has convinced me that, if the School Boards have enormous pecuniary and material advantages, on the other hand our voluntary system has advantages, less material, but not less real; and if we can but bring this fact home to the minds of Churchmen, they will see their duty, and will support our schools. As for telling us that the Church of England is not rich enough, not public-spirited enough, and not earnest enough to do the work if it only sees that work to be necessary, I hold this a slander against the communion to which we belong. I am quite certain that schools which in the first place have unpriced and priceless voluntary labour at their command, which in the next place give a security for permanent religious education which the School Board system cannot secure, and which, moreover, have at their back that authority which the Church has always exercised, have still a function to perform. Once let us convince Churchmen that there is this real function, and the Church will show again that what men of the world call impossibilities can be met by her, because she has power to do impossibilities, of which they do not, and cannot, dream.

Rev. Dr Marshall, Rector of St John Baptist, Hulme, Manchester.

Although the subject before the meeting is pupil-teachers and School Boards, I think an important point has not yet been touched upon. The importance of the religious education of pupil-teachers cannot of course be exaggerated. It is of immediate and also of intermediate importance. It is of immediate importance because of the influence pupil-teachers exercise on the children of the school. Mr Kennedy laid stress on the teacher having a personal acquaintance with the children. Now, in large schools this becomes very difficult, if not altogether impossible, and therefore the importance of the influence of the pupil-teacher upon the children of their schools must not be lost sight of. But not only is it of immediate importance, but it is also of intermediate importance, because the pupil-teacher is the future teacher of our schools, and the revelations which Mr Kennedy has made show us the immense consequence, not merely of religious instruction, but of religious education. Something has been said this morning upon the care the clergy ought to take of their pupil-teachers. I am happy to think that in a large number of cases—I should be disposed to

think in the largest number—the clergy do take a very careful interest in their pupil-teachers and in their religious education. But between the close of the pupil-teacher's pupil-life and commencing the commencement of the teacher's life, there occur two very important years—I mean the years of his residence in the training college; and I think it of the first importance that at the training college the spiritual privileges and the spiritual care of the pupil-teacher should not be less than during the years of his apprenticeship. For example, if a pupil-teacher has been very carefully trained in the spiritual life, if to the age of eighteen he has had constant intercourse upon the affairs of his spiritual life with his pastor, it is most desirable that he should have a similar opportunity when he is in the training college. If, again, he has had an opportunity of early celebration of the holy communion once a week at home, and if there has been impressed upon him the importance of the self-denial of our daily communion—and I put it upon no other ground—it is vastly important that at a training college we should have something more than a monthly communion, and that in the middle of the day. These points I give only by way of illustration. Now if my brethren of the clergy are satisfied that after their pupil-teachers have left them for two years, with whom they have taken very great pains and care, if they find them return to them advanced in the spiritual life, then I have spoken in vain; but if they find some of the delicate bloom which they have so carefully cultivated in the spiritual life of their pupil-teachers is shaken off, then I think it is worth being noted at a Church Congress.

The Rev. Henry Bowlby, M.A., Rector of St Philip's, Birmingham.

I think I shall best use the short time which is allotted to me, if I say a very few words upon the subject of the Church and the School Boards. The first word that I should like to say to my brother school managers of existing denominational schools, is to reiterate the advice that has been already given, not to transfer their schools to the School Boards. There may be great difficulty in carrying on voluntary schools, and the terms of transfer offered at the present moment may seem to be tempting and advantageous, but there is no guarantee that those terms will be permanent, that they may not be modified and altered in a sense disadvantageous to the voluntary school, after a lapse of time, during which the whole school machinery has been laid aside, and it is almost impossible to re-establish it upon its old basis. The next word of advice that I would venture to give, is also a reiteration of what has been already said, do not assume a position of antagonism to existing School Boards: consider the good that they have already done. We have a very distinguished member of the London School Board present, who has already addressed you, Canon Barry, but he did not tell you, I believe, what has been put before the public lately, with reference to the beneficial operation of the London School Board, that they have filled 40,000 vacant places out of 50,000, in the voluntary schools by the agency of their summoning officer, and here I would bear testimony to the impartial way in which the summoning officer in Birmingham fulfils his duty, by filling the vacant places in voluntary schools, as well as in the Board Schools. He has not told you what Sir Charles Reed, the chairman of the London School Board, has told us recently, in his admirable summary, what a large proportion of the street arabs have been gathered into school, through the agency of the London School Board. When we look at this, and the other enormous benefits which have accrued to the cause of education from the action of School Boards, I think it would be improper on the part of the Church to assume any opposition of antagonism to them; rather ought we to utilise this most valuable instrument to endeavour, as far as possible, to take part in the election, and endeavour to secure the best and most efficient members of the Church, who understand the subject of education best, to represent us on the School Boards, and to work that system honestly and fairly. But what if certain School Boards should, as I have good reason to know to my sorrow

they do, refuse altogether that religious instruction should be imparted by their own paid school teachers? What if School Boards should refuse to carry out the 25th clause of the Education Act, and decline to pay the fees of indigent parents in denominational schools, thereby in the name of liberty restricting the religious liberty of the parents? What if they should set up free schools, or penny schools in the immediate neighbourhood of existing schools? I say then they must be treated as we would treat a patient in a fever. This cannot last, it is indefensible upon their own principles, and therefore it cannot endure. So in the School Board if you can, send the best representative even to these School Boards that you possibly can, and I believe that a time will come, when this which is a mere theoretical illustration of extreme visions, will pass away like the fever of a sickly patient. It is most unfortunate, that politics have been mixed up with the election of School Boards; it is most unfortunate that they have assumed to themselves a position which the Education Act never intended to give them; and that there has been a tendency in certain quarters to erect themselves into a separate education department, professing to control the education, both of the higher and middle classes; and this must be resisted.

The Rev. Evan Daniel, M.A., Principal of the National Society's Training College, Battersea.

I propose addressing myself to the effects of recent legislation upon Church schools. They are in the position at the present moment, with regard to educational matters, of an invading army which has ceased to conquer. We find it as much as we can do to maintain our ground and hold our own. After planting schools through the length and breadth of the land, the Church of England suddenly finds her arm paralysed, and the provision of school accommodation has practically ceased, so far as the Church of England is concerned. Here and there some bold clergyman may still be found who is prepared to undertake the enormous difficulty of planting a new school or extending an old one, but practically the Church of England has ceased to provide additional school accommodation for the poor of this country. [No! No!]* I am speaking of facts which can be attested by the returns of the Government blue books, and I know perfectly well that I have abundant authority for saying that the provision for school accommodation has practically ceased. We are not only not adding new schools at the same rate as formerly, but we are losing our hold upon the schools we have. A recent Parliamentary return shows that 166 schools have been transferred to School Boards. Some 70 of those have been transferred in perpetuity, and the Church has lost hold of them entirely; large numbers have been transferred for a lease of seven years. Now this is a most serious matter. I cannot understand how any clergyman can recommend the transfer of a Church school to a School Board. The command, "Feed my lambs," was given by our Lord, not to a School Board, but to the Church of Christ, and I cannot understand how the Church of Christ can surrender its obligation in this respect. But we have not come to the end of the matter; there are large numbers of schools at this moment in a most critical condition, and the difficulties are increasing, so that we may look forward to a still larger transfer than has already taken place. We must not shut our eyes to this fact. There are numbers of schools at this moment in a most critical condition; their clergymen are carrying them on under the greatest possible difficulties, and unless some efforts are made to aid them, these schools will inevitably be transferred to the School Board. Now what can be done? Something must be done, and immediately. I believe that the Church, by making a great effort, may at least keep her hold upon the schools we have already. I believe by making a bold effort she may even do more, and go on providing additional school accommodation, but at present her arm is paralysed; it is not merely that the Government building grants are now withheld.

* The speaker desires to say, that in making this assertion, he had mainly in view those places where School Boards have been established.

it is that Churchmen do not feel any security in providing schools. They do not feel that, having built a school, it will remain in the hands of the Church. By the Act of 1870 a school may now be transferred to a School Board, even though its founder be a man opposed to that transfer. With this sense of insecurity is it surprising that the Church of England does not go on building schools as she did formerly? It seems to me that the bishops might do much by intervening to prevent this transfer. I know of one case in which, when a clergyman contemplated a transfer of his school to a School Board, the bishop most kindly intervened, came down and preached sermons for the school, and raised in the offertories of a single day enough of money to place the school in a solvent position. There are two things we must insist upon, and must insist on them before the meeting of next Parliament. We must have a share in the School Board rate. It is a shame and a disgrace that Churchmen should have to maintain their own schools, and at the same time have to maintain the School Board schools. If we provide secular education as well as religious education, we ought at least to receive out of the school-rates a certain sum that would help to defray the expenses of the secular part of the instruction we give. This is a simple matter of justice and equity, which we as Churchmen must insist upon. There is one other point we must insist upon; we must have larger grants, proportioned to the increased cost of maintaining schools. We were promised them, but we have not had them, and I do hope we shall not be satisfied until we get them.

The Rev. J. M. Du Port, M.A., Vicar of Mattishall, Norfolk.

I would supplement the advice which has just been given to Church of England people not to surrender their voluntary schools by an example from history. Up to the last eight years the Nonconformists most nobly sustained their own chapels, while they continued to pay their church-rates. Will not the Church of England be noble enough to copy this example, and will not her members who have the misfortune to live under School Boards undertake to pay their school-rates, and at the same time not only continue to pay, but even increase, their subscriptions to the voluntary schools? The other point upon which I wish to say a few words is the instruction of our pupil-teachers. The fact that the pupil-teacher is engaged usually for five years necessarily requires that the subjects in which he is to be instructed should be divided into five periods, and that the matter contained in these periods should be distributed over those five years. Now, that may be done in two ways, and that which is most common is, I believe, open to many serious objections. The usual way is to divide the subject, be it the Old Testament, the New Testament, or the Prayer-Book, into five portions, and to teach the pupil-teachers of the first year one of these portions—we will suppose, the early part of the history, from the Creation to the death of Moses; then with the second year pupil-teachers to take the next period, from the death of Moses to the death of Joshua, and so on to the end, treating the New Testament and the Prayer-Book in exactly the same manner. To teach on this plan may be all very easy where you have only one pupil-teacher, but in those schools where you have three or more pupil-teachers, it is not possible, in the limited time which the exigencies of the case require, and with the limitation of the time which the parish priest—and, I may say, that in my opinion the parish priest should take some part in the education himself—has to spend in such an education, —it is not possible, I say, to give more than two hours a week to this part of the education of the pupil-teacher. Now, how is it possible if you give two hours a week (and if you can do so much as that, probably you would give one hour to the boys and another to the girls), to teach those subjects to three or more pupil-teachers of different standings? You divide your time into three parts; that allows twenty minutes to the Old Testament, twenty minutes to the New, and twenty minutes to the Prayer-Book; and each of these twenty minutes is to be divided into three or four parts, according to the number you have to teach; that leaves just five minutes for teaching the Old Testament, five minutes for the New, and five minutes for the Prayer-

Book. The plan which has been adopted in the dioceses of Norwich and Exeter, and in one other diocese, I believe, seems to be much more practicable than that. The subjects are divided into five portions as usual, but all the pupil-teachers, whatever their standing, are taught the same portion at the same time, those of each higher year being carried a little more deeply in the subjects than those of the lower ones. That particular portion of the subject which forms the basis of the instruction of all the pupil-teachers is changed every year, and thus in the five years' course the pupil-teacher is instructed in the whole of the subject. The advantage of this method of arrangement is that all the pupil-teachers in a school, whatever their standing, can all be taught together; and the teaching of the fuller details to the pupil-teachers in the higher years only impresses the subject more forcibly on the younger ones, though these are not required to master the more advanced parts of the subject. I think that we, the clergy, might well spare the hour a week which, with some such arrangement as that sketched out, would be ample for the important work, and thus roll away the reproach that Canon Norris has most justly laid at our doors, that not 40 per cent. of the students that enter training colleges have ever had any religious instruction from their parish priest.

The Rev. James Sweet, M.A., Rural Dean, Rector of Barton in Fabis, near Nottingham.

I am anxious to say, in the presence of this representative meeting of the Church, a word on behalf of an aggrieved class, to which the sympathies of Churchmen are more due, I think, than most of the previous speakers have realised; I mean that large class of educationalists, not merely in the Church of England, but to be found also amongst Roman Catholics and Methodists, who struggle to maintain voluntary schools for the sake of definite religious teaching, against all the difficulties which the Act of 1870 has raised. There is a system of what is called painless extinction going on at the present moment, the extent of which the National Society has ascertained and published. This grievance is not imaginary, but is very extensive, and is one upon which this great Congress ought to express itself. Yet until the last speaker but one addressed you, scarcely a word was said except in the way of hope, and I think very delusive hope, of the continuance of voluntary schools in spite of the weight under which they labour. Now I desire to state in a summary way what are the three grievances imposed by the Act of 1870 upon persons maintaining voluntary schools from religious motives side by side with rate-supported schools. I am not questioning for a moment the honourable intention of the promoters of that Act; I am speaking of the unforeseen issues and results. There is a threefold grievance, and it may be very simply stated. Let us suppose that we are in the position of working an extensive voluntary school, for God's sake and our fellow creatures' sake, side by side with a Board School, with which we may not wish in any undue way to interfere. This is our grievance; we are first required either to strike our flag and sacrifice our conscience, or to pay twice where others pay once. That has been already spoken of. In the next place, we are required to pay upon one of these two occasions for what our conscience disapproves; and as if that was not enough, we pay this to enable those who approve the system which we disapprove, to put our system under that painless extinction of which I spoke before. We pay for what we disapprove that it may ultimately destroy that which we do approve. But again, as if this were not sufficient to make a grievance which any but that long-suffering community, the Church of England, would long since have trumpeted before both the Houses of Parliament, if the Board School fail, to meet the requirements of the Government Inspector, the managers of the Board School can come to us to make up the deficiency, to make us bear a fresh burden to supply the lack of the Government grant which fails; but if our schools fail, where are we? We are ourselves compelled to make up that deficiency, without succour from other sources, and thus to maintain these three great grievances of a fiscal nature, which ought to be regarded by the

House of Commons and the House of Lords as a very ample reason for remedying the evil under which we suffer. I would therefore draw the attention of this Congress to a form of petition, which I hope may be within their reach to-morrow, to which one and all, who desire to promote education without any undue rivalry with other bodies, but with the liberty which Englishmen and Churchmen have a right to expect, will sign. It is a form of petition issued by the National Society. It is asking Parliament to provide some relief on the Education Act of 1870, on the ground that it presses unfairly upon subscribers to voluntary schools, especially on those who conscientiously disapprove of the religious teaching, or rather the absence of religious teaching, in the Board Schools. It asks Parliament to provide a remedy; it does not dictate the exact form; but had not the bell struck, I would have asked you to suggest the adoption of the Canadian form.

The Rev. W. Maxwell M. Ben-Oliel.

There can be no question that the tendency of the age is to dissociate the secular from the spiritual. Rome herself has felt the power of the spirit of the age, and has had to give up the temporal power, and it will be a happy day for Rome, when he who sits in the Vatican will be content to wield the spiritual sceptre, and abandon all hopes o grasping again the temporal sceptre. We, too, in this country are feeling the effects of the spirit of the age. The Act of 1870 is a fact. No one, so far as I know, and I have been a member of a School Board, proposes to repeal that Act. We must, therefore, make the best of it as it is, unless we can indeed, as has been suggested by previous speakers, pass some amendment for the better working of its provisions. Now, what has that Act done? I consider that that Act has *in principle* taken away the education of the poor from the Church, and given it to the State. The Church has no option now but to adapt herself to this altered state of things. I am not aware that any one considers it the duty of the Church, primarily, to teach arithmetic and book-keeping. The mission of the Church is to teach men religion and morality so as to fit them to discharge their duties on earth, and to gain by and by an entrance into that better world, for which God has made us all. Now, why not let the State take charge of the secular education of its subjects, and let the Church confine herself to the spiritual, moral, and religious education of her children, not only on Sundays, but on week days. This is the only suggestion which I have time to bring before this great Congress. The School Boards, as a rule, make it a bye-law, that attendance at school should be limited to about five hours a day. It strikes me that the Church would do well if she were to catch the children on their way to school and take them to Church, first, for half-an-hour's instruction, and catch them again as they come from school in the evening, and give them another half-hour's instruction. Why not? Thank God we have many of our churches, I wish we could say all, open for daily service, and for private prayer. Why not take the children after matins of a morning, and give them half-an-hour's catechising, and another half-hour's catechising before evensong in the evening. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Church would only rise to her duty in this matter, and thus gather the lambs of Christ's flock into Christ's own fold, the Church, and there in God's House teach them God's truth; in sight of the font where they have been baptized, in sight of the altar where one day they will receive the sacrament, and the body and blood of the incarnate God—there teach them religion, morality, and duty, then I think this Education Act will not have been altogether an unmixed evil.

The Rev. C. F. Lowder, M.A.

I wish, if possible, to touch upon what has been said about the transfer of voluntary schools to School Boards, by putting before you this thought, that we must ignore School Boards as providing any religious education, if we take the standard which Mr Kennedy has so beautifully set before us this morning as the standard of religious educa-

tion. If we hope to reach anything like a religious standard of education in our schools, it is quite impossible that we can in any way accept that imperfect mutilated system of religious education, even if we might suppose that the Apostles' Creed could be taught. Canon Melville says it might be taught, but yet we know it is not taught, and as we have to consider what religious education given in Board Schools is at present, and we are not likely to be able to raise this standard in the time to come; therefore I say, let all those who are for the transfer of voluntary schools to School Boards, consider that they are giving up religious education, and the daily teaching in schools altogether. They must therefore be prepared to provide such a system of religious education outside the Board Schools, as will come up to that standard, which every priest of the Church of England is bound to provide for the children of his flock. This would be the case wherever Board Schools are already established, but I believe that our great encouragement in meeting the difficulty with regard to Board Schools, is in recognising the fact that there is a soul in the voluntary schools, which there is not in the Board Schools, and if we show our children what religious education is, as Mr Kennedy has taught us, if we teach them to love the great doctrines of the Church, if we teach them morality, on the very highest principles, which in Board Schools they cannot be taught, because the mouths of the teachers are gagged upon so many subjects, then we show children what religious education really is, for in our catechising in Church, which is a most important means of religious education, and which I hope we shall all of us be stirred up to practise more diligently, we have an immense engine. Many of us complain, that it is difficult to keep up our Sunday schools to the standard that we desire, and to get the right persons as teachers. Now in catechising in Church, the priest of the parish may himself teach his children, may bring his influence to bear upon all his children, may teach them in such loving, in such distinct, and in such dogmatic terms, unfettered by any thought of the conscience clause or anything else, speaking freely, openly, and unreservedly to his children, that I am quite sure that if we can only bring our catechising up to this point, while we connect it with the teaching in our schools, we shall show our school children what Christian education is, and then I am quite sure we shall draw them by love and affection from the Board Schools. They will feel how very different a thing religious instruction (so called) in Board Schools is to religious education in a Church School, and we shall win them not by the compulsion of the School Board visitors, but by the love and attraction of affection; we shall speak to their hearts.

The Rev. Canon Walsham How.

With regard to the severance of religious education from secular education, I think there can be but one opinion in this great meeting, and therefore I shall say nothing about that, except as to one little point. We have been told by the advocates of secularism in education, that an equal amount of morality and good conduct can be obtained without religious teaching. Of course *we* do not believe that. But mark what is to be the substitute for religious motives. A secularist leader of some note tells us that we ought to teach our children the value of civilisation, and to put before them as a motive for their morality and good conduct, the grandeur of that advancing tide of civilisation, which their good conduct would promote. I suppose, to put it practically, we ought to call up a little child who has told a lie, and to argue with it thus:—"Your lie, my little child, is a hindrance to the amelioration of humanity. Of course, in itself it is a very small thing, but then every little item tends towards the advancing, or the retarding of the majestic progress of the human race." I am not quite sure, how far that line of argument would tell upon juvenile rustics. I have never tried the experiment, and I do not mean to.

Then we come to the next point, which is, how far we are to admit and approve of religious education, which abstains from any great definiteness of teaching. Here, again, I think we shall be nearly unanimous. Of course, if I were obliged, under the School Board

system, to try my hand at teaching children a colourless religion, I should do my best. I have never been one who has denounced School Boards as a wicked invention, or set my face against them in all cases, because I believe they were a necessity, and have done great good in many places. But I desire to press this consideration: we have at present among our school-teachers most admirable teachers of religion; and I wish to bear strong testimony to this point, because it is sometimes overlooked. We sometimes talk only of the clergyman taking the religious teaching, while a great many of the teachers can do it a great deal better. But this is what I want to press,—that in order to have good religious teachers, you want enthusiasm, and you cannot get up any enthusiasm for a neutral tint. What Canon Kennedy said, was most touching with regard to the actual religious state of the teachers themselves, and it reminded me of an illustration once made use of by Canon Norris, which I venture to repeat. He reminded a large meeting of school teachers, of that beautiful picture with which we are all familiar, Dante and Beatrice, how, while the gracious guide was leading on her earthly companion, and teaching him the beautiful truths she was explaining, her eyes were fixed, not upon him, but upon heaven. I want our teachers to be enthusiastic in teaching religion, and I do not believe they will be enthusiastic, unless they can teach a definite religion. And now one more point. It has often been said by advocates of purely secular teaching, that the religious teaching given in our schools at present is not worth very much. I deny that altogether; I believe it to be worth a very great deal, and in two different ways. First, as an actual possession to the children. I know, by my own experience, how valuable this religious teaching is, even to very young children. I have in many instances known it to become a real practical power in their young lives. I have known it brought home to parents, and precious on children's death-beds. Then, secondly, it is of the greatest possible value as an educational instrument. Government inspectors have allowed, that where the religious teaching is taken away from a school by the action of a School Board, there the secular teaching at once deteriorates. There is nothing which draws out all the powers of the child like the religious lesson if it is well given. Geography and arithmetic are all very well in their way; they are good educational instruments; but they do not touch the child in all its parts, they do not exercise its moral powers, they do not draw out its emotional or its imaginative side. It is the religious lesson which will most of all bring out the whole powers of the child, and educate all its faculties, because it is the religious lesson which alone enters into all the child's daily life, and bears on its motives and feelings, its hopes, fears, its duties and trials. For these reasons I strongly advocate, wherever it is possible, the extension of definite religious teaching in our schools.

The Rev. H. Knight Eaton, Vicar of Christ's Church, Stafford.

For the very few minutes permitted me to address you on this subject, I will do so upon two practical points, which, I think, are of exceeding importance—attendance and funds. In the first place, the great question is how we can have regularity in our schools; how we can get the children to come to school daily and always at the right hour. The other question is, and it is also of vast practical importance, how our schools shall obtain funds to pay for the expense of carrying them on. I think those two may be united if the legislature would enable all those who manage schools to take from the parents a prepayment of not more than half-a-crown a quarter. If the parents paid in advance half-a-crown a quarter, which is less than threepence a week, the consequence would be that they would keep the children at school, because the children were paid for. If, further than that, no parent was allowed to withdraw a child from school unless he gave a quarter's notice, or paid half-a-crown, the effect would be that we should not have that fearful running from school to school which is one of the greatest difficulties in teaching the children—never permitted

in higher schools. A great advantage would also accrue, that we should have then nearly sufficient funds to carry on our schools upon the old system. I have written a letter upon this subject, which I hope may be placed upon paper, if the President will permit it.* I would merely add, that any one who knows the working of schools will see at once what a great loss there is from those children whose names are on the book, but whose parents do not pay for their education ; or in other words, what a great gain there would be if we had, say, 10s. a year from 1000 children, instead of only 3d per week from 700, which is about the average attendance. We should have the difference between, that £350 and £500, to enable us to carry on the school efficiently.

Mr Dickinson.

In this most interesting and important discussion, I think there is hardly attention enough given to the special interest of agricultural schools in the south of England, which I know most about. I asked a friend of mine, a good evangelic clergyman working in an unhealthy place, the other day, whether, supposing his vestry were able to give him twenty pounds a year to help his school, they would do so? He replied, Undoubtedly. It seems to me, the thing we want most is, that there should be power given by the Legislature to the vestry of voting a grant of money in aid of denominational schools. In my country, Somersetshire, I am sure it would be a most beneficial thing if that could be done. With regard to compulsion, the best compulsion is what my friend Mr Lowder proposed, the compulsion of kindness and attraction. I have great fear of compulsive force of law. In my country it means to many of the families of the poor simply starvation. They are obliged to live on the bread won by the labour of their children. They cannot do without it, and if you compel the children to go to school, they must starve or go to the Union. Compulsion must be administered with very great care. I think there ought to be a power, but it should be a power to be mitigated according to necessity. It seems to me totally unnecessary that there should be a Board School or a Board at all to have compulsion. I never could see why the parochial authorities in the county should not have the power of compulsion, when compulsion is necessary.

The Dean of Chester.

The two minutes allowed me give ample time to say one thing, and that one thing ought, I conceive, to be strongly said ; and for the saying of that one thing, I have been listening all this morning. No reference, however, to it has been made, except incidentally by my friend Canon Barry. What I think we want above all things, is that these towns and districts which have shown themselves in earnest in the work of education, and yet do not wish for a School Board, should be armed with compulsory powers without a School Board. It is a very serious thing for such a town and such a district, under the necessity of compulsory powers, to be forced to adopt a Board, which otherwise they would not desire. Such danger exists in many places, including the town where I reside. In the first place, to form a School Board, merely for compulsory powers, is to bring into existence a very elaborate machinery for a very simple thing. Then again the School Board involves a thousand risks as regards the persons elected, and excites a great deal of party feeling. Moreover, you cannot get rid of a School Board when you once have one. Again, there is great danger, lest the temper of a School Board with regard to religion should change at each election, as we have seen in the case of Birmingham. At the same time, I strongly deprecate any approach to speaking of School Boards in a hostile spirit. I am very glad that my friend Canon Jackson said what he did so strongly upon that subject.

* To be had from Miss Wright, bookseller, Stafford.

The Earl of Harrowby.

I have listened, of course with great interest, to the very interesting addresses which we have heard. I do not want to touch upon anything which concerns a possible action of the Government. I am grieved whenever I hear of the transfer of a denominational school to a School Board, although I do not coincide in everything which is said against a School Board school, but a denominational school, well and wisely conducted, is, no doubt, a much better thing than a Board School. At the same time I must beg you to observe this. I say, if it is well and wisely conducted, but it does not follow that every denominational school, because it is denominational, must therefore be a better school than the best Board School, such as many of them are,—Manchester, for instance. You may be quite sure the people of England will support generously denominational schools if they see that those denominational schools are really and more essentially religious than the School Board schools. They do not so much support a denominational school, simply because it is denominational; they want security for a religious school, and they hope to find that security in its being denominational. But there are cases where great struggles are made to secure a denominational school, and those struggles having been successful, little attention is afterwards paid to maintain the really religious character of that school. To that point I would call the attention of the clergy and all other managers of denominational schools. Let them keep in mind that what people mean when they are anxious for denominational schools is, that they shall be schools where religion and morals are more distinctly and successfully taught than in other schools. That is the only point I wish to enforce upon this assembly, and it is a thing to be kept strictly in view, that whatever Parliament and the Congress may settle, the strength of the denominational system must always be its being more really religious and moral than any other.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, 6th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. Bishop Hobhouse took the Chair at a quarter-past Ten.

ECCLESIASTICAL DILAPIDATIONS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. W. Fraser, D.C.L., Vicar of Alton, Staffordshire, Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Lichfield, and Chaplain to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

I undertook to prepare a paper on the question of ecclesiastical dilapidations, on a very short notice, in consequence of the inability of Prebendary Gibbs, to whom it had been entrusted, to attend the Congress. Prebendary Gibbs has obliged me with the perusal of his intended paper, and for some of the remarks which I shall make I am indebted to him.

Ecclesiastical dilapidations vitally interest the beneficed clergy, but do

not affect other classes of society in a corresponding degree. Dilapidation, or as it is technically called Waste, is defined as "the pulling down or destroying in any manner any of the houses or buildings belonging to a Spiritual living; or the suffering them to fall into ruin or decay; or the wasting or destroying the woods of the Church; or the committing or suffering any wilful waste in or upon the inheritance of the Church." To commit or permit any such waste or dilapidation is a spiritual offence punishable in a Spiritual court, even by suspension or deprivation; and the powers of the Spiritual courts in this respect, have been reserved in the recent statutory legislation on dilapidations.

In regard to the glebe of the Church, dilapidations are only incurred in regard to the gates, fences, and buildings upon it, which must be kept in good repair. The law pays no attention to the land itself, which may be exhausted to any extent by an out-going incumbent, and the new incumbent has no redress; and at the same time no consideration is given to the question of "unexhausted improvements," and no allowance is made for them. This should be remedied in any future legislation.

Timber trees growing on the glebe may be lopped for fuel, but may not be cut down except for repairs; but it is allowable to cut down timber and to sell it, and to apply the proceeds of the sale to repairs. The same rule applies to timber trees growing in the churchyard and the repairs of the Church.

The law in respect of mines, coal-mines, quarries, gravel-pits and clay-pits, in the glebe appears to be intricate and perplexing, and time will not now allow me to attempt to disentangle it.

But the chief concern of the law of ecclesiastical dilapidations is the buildings of the Church, the residences of the incumbents, the buildings standing on the glebe, and the chancels of the churches in the care of rectories. It is held that the endowments of the Church are not only a provision for the maintenance of the clergyman in each parish, but are also for the maintenance of the Church's buildings. Each incumbent, therefore, out of the endowments of his living is to keep his parsonage in good repair. It is the duty of the Archdeacon, and of the Ordinary generally, to visit and inspect all ecclesiastical buildings, and to require that all needed repairs should be duly carried out: and an incumbent may be prosecuted at visitations for allowing his residence to fall into decay. Parsonages, being spiritual property, proceedings to prevent dilapidations should properly be taken in the Spiritual courts. But the courts of equity and of common law also took cognizance of them, and a patron could obtain an injunction in Chancery to restrain waste.

But as we all know this method of preventing dilapidations was not the general custom. The usual practice among the clergy was that, on the avoidance of a benefice by death or otherwise, two surveyors should be appointed, one on the side of the representatives of the last, and one on the side of the new incumbent; each of these made his valuation, and did his best for his employer; and they endeavoured between them to arrive at some fair compromise. But if they could not eventually agree upon a sum to be paid and received for dilapidations; the matter had to come before the courts of Common Law. For in the case of houses and buildings an action for damages will lie, upon the custom of England for rectors and vicars to leave their buildings in repair to their successors.

Under the old law, the parsonage was not necessarily to be put into a state of complete and perfect repair: but everything that was decayed was to be restored, and all such repairs were to be made as were needful for the preservation of the premises. No allowance was made for additions or improvements. In strict law, no alteration in the way of addition or improvement ought to have been made without a faculty being first obtained from the Spiritual court, and such an addition or improvement, however made, was as liable to the payment for dilapidations as the rest of the building. This state of things was full of inconveniences. When the surveyors for either party could not agree, and both sides were determined to assert their claims, and to defend themselves, expensive and embittered litigation was inevitably the result. In other cases the incumbent died insolvent, and the new clergyman had to submit to a heavy loss. And again there were many cases where compassion for a widow and orphans, left poorly provided for, or friendly feelings, or other similar motives, had their effect, and the dilapidations were not duly assessed, and the Church's property suffered damage. For it must be recollected that an agreement not to claim for dilapidations was not necessarily simoniacal; and an understanding, that the widow of the last incumbent was not to be too hardly pressed for dilapidations, was a contingency neither unnatural nor uncommon in the bestowing or accepting a living.

But however kind, liberal, and unselfish such an understanding may appear, there was in it an element of injustice; for the out-going and the in-coming incumbents are not the only parties concerned in the matter. There is a third party, the Church, whose buildings ought to be sustained and kept in repair for the benefit, not of the individual, but of the whole body of the faithful. From one point of view the incumbent is the freeholder of the benefice; but from another he is a tenant for life, and the estate is held by him for the advantage of the Church. Bishop Gibson has laid down that "the repairing of dilapidations is in the strictest sense a debt to the Church, and that it is the duty of the Bishops to see that the Church is no loser by any life-occupier of her benefices" (*Codex Jur. Eccl.* tit. 38).

The law being in this state, and the inconveniences resulting to the Clergy being many, it had long been an object of desire that some measure should be enacted by Parliament, which would prevent dilapidations from accruing while the living was full; would place the assessment of them upon a better footing after a vacancy; and thus would be just to the Church while giving security to the existing incumbent.

The Convocation of Canterbury appointed a committee to consider the principles on which such a measure should be based. In 1860 the committee reported in favour of these principles.—

1. The appointment of surveyors to inspect triennially; 2. The certificate of the surveyor to secure incumbents from claims for dilapidations; 3. The expenses of the surveyor to be an annual charge on benefices; 4. Existing incumbents to be exempt, except they wished otherwise, from the new law.

The first three propositions were made the foundation of a bill which was brought into Parliament; and which was in 1862, rejected by the House of Lords.

The Convocations both of Canterbury and York again appointed

committees; and a conference of the two committees drew up a report which was presented in 1867, and on this report, with some modifications, the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act of 1871 was based. This Act 34 and 35 Vic. c. 43, with its amending Act, 35 and 36 Vic. c. 96, constitute the present law on dilapidations as regards buildings. It was expected to prove a great boon to the clergy, but it has turned out in the working to be a cause of hardship and a source of disappointment. I have endeavoured to set this question before the Congress in its legal and equitable aspects, and to treat it in a calm and dispassionate way. I am afraid the Congress finds it rather a dull one. Some little time ago there was a discussion in the newspapers about vivisection, and the men of science wrote letters about vivisection in a very calm and dispassionate style. If the vivisected animals had been able to write to the newspapers also, the statement of the question from their point of view would have been much more excited. They would have shown that it was impossible to repress a howl or a groan when the lancet cut deep: and the clergy feel something in the same way under the operation of this Dilapidations' Act. I have here a clergyman's statement of a case of hardship. I might call it the groan of a vivisected vicar. He was presented in 1870, before this Act was passed, to a living in Essex worth £190 per annum. The last incumbent was a pauper. The patrons represented to him that there were no dilapidations, because there was no parsonage house. A part of the endowment was a farm rented at £42 per annum. On leaving the living in 1873 the dilapidations which had to be paid on the farm house were £126.

It would be easy to call together a perfect chorus of sympathisers and sufferers,

> "Condemned alike to groan—
> The feeling for another's pain,
> The unfeeling for his own."

It may be laid down as a general principle, that no legislation can make the extracting money, from a poor incumbent with a small benefice, to pay large dilapidations, a pleasurable operation. It always is, and must remain, a painful one. And it must also be borne in mind, that the cost of labour for building, and of building materials, has doubled at least of late years; while the incomes of the clergy have not increased.

But taking all this into account, the broad fact remains, that this Act was intended by those who first promoted it to prevent dilapidations from accruing. It, therefore, ought to have been an aid and a boon to the clergy; and it has proved the reverse. It ought to have afforded facilities for avoiding dilapidations; and it has not done so. Very few of the clergy have availed themselves of its provisions voluntarily, and why?

I will touch in reply on some few of the difficulties thrown in the way of those who wish to use the Act for obtaining certificates of immunity from dilapidation charges; the making such certificates general and popular, being the one object which any wise legislation on the subject ought to aim at.

The Act appointed an official surveyor, in each archdeaconry, whose certificate, after repairs had been executed, was to insure five years' immunity to the incumbents. This surveyor is paid by fees; and by the amendment Act of 1872, the two Archbishops, the Lord Chancellor and the two Vicars General, were empowered to fix and to frame a scale of fees,

during the year 1873, for the payment of surveyors, bishops, secretaries, and registrars, for the whole kingdom. They let the time elapse without doing so, and there is no uniform scale of fees at this moment.

When the surveyor is voluntarily called in, the clergy do not know what they are going to be charged; and it may happen that the fees to be paid to the surveyor and to the officials, may even exceed the sum assessed for repairs: and if no repairs are needed, the Act makes no provision for the certificate being granted. The fees to the surveyor are necessarily large; because the devices of an eminent and skilful man are called into requisition, and his time is valuable: but it often happens that fences, and gates, and out-buildings lying at a distance from the parsonage, have to be surveyed, and there the services of a less eminent man would be equally useful, and the payments in such cases might be proportionately smaller.

The surveyors have an autocratic power in settling what dilapidations are. The old law did not require the buildings to be placed in the same state as new buildings; but under this Act some surveyors appear to do so.

It seems only reasonable that substantial improvements should be taken into account and placed to the credit of the last incumbent; but they are not.

The whole question of what is called "insensible waste" or "reasonable wear and tear" ought to be settled and defined, and a distinction drawn between insensible and wilful waste. In regard to estimating insensible waste, there is, I understand, no uniformity of practice among the surveyors. But in the case of farm houses and buildings, the insensible waste of a century, perhaps, has to be made good by the incumbent under the Act of 1872. This is especially the case with small livings augmented by Queen Anne's Bounty, which are always poor, and where the farm-buildings under the old law have gradually got out of repair. An incumbent may, it is true, try to borrow money from Queen Anne's Bounty to carry out the repairs required; but, by the Act, Queen Anne's Bounty may refuse to lend it: and what is to become of the poor incumbent then?

If he succeeds in obtaining a loan, the charge for it by Jillbert's Acts is fixed at £10, 15s., and if he wishes to make an addition to his residence at the same time, he must pay the same sum on another loan. This is a hardship. One such payment ought to cover both.

I have only touched on some of the hardships, difficulties, and inconsistencies connected with the optional survey while the living is full. I leave it to others to animadvert on those connected with the compulsory survey on the vacancy of a living.

The measure I have dealt with fails of being useful and fails of being just. Another measure which shall accomplish what it has failed in, is imperatively called for.

Mr R. Reynolds Rowe, F.R.I.B.A., F.S.A., Diocesan Surveyor of Ely.

Secular dilapidations are, as regards leases, assessed according to the special language of the repairing covenant in each lease; as regards other lay tenancies dilapidations are valued according to the principles ruling numerous legal decisions thereon; some allowance for wear and tear is

made because the rent paid entitles the tenant to the fair usufruct of the gradual consuming property.

But the principle upon which surveyors estimate ecclesiastical dilapidations is entirely different to that ruling secular dilapidations, and was clearly laid down by Mr Justice Bayley in the year 1829, in his lucid judgment, after a most elaborate discussion, in the case of Wise *v.* Metcalf (10 Barn. and Cress. 299). That judgment enables properly qualified surveyors to define the nature of the repairs which an incumbent is bound to do to the buildings attached to his benefice, and to estimate their expense upon a definite and equitable basis. As an incumbent enjoys the occupation of buildings and premises for which he pays no rent, the legal presumption is, that he is bound to hand them on to his successor in as good a condition as when they were first built.

Formerly, the custom was for the new incumbent to appoint a surveyor, or too often a local appraiser, to claim as much as possible for him. The late incumbent, or his executor, often entrusted to the auctioneer of the furniture in the parsonage the duty of opposing the claim to be made for dilapidations; the two representatives met, and after agreeing to the name of an umpire who was to settle any differences between them, they wrangled and disputed upon first principles, rules of practice, and every conceivable detail. The matter was then, from the necessity of the case, referred to the umpire; thus, the sum to be paid was in point of fact the expression of opinion of one man who was probably unable to cope with the subject. If the sum awarded was duly paid, it by no means followed that the necessary repairs were executed, although the 14th Elizabeth c. 11. s. 18 made it penal not to expend, within two years, money recovered for dilapidations.

These and other abuses brought about the "The Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, 1871," for the purpose, not of setting up a new standard of perfection in glebe buildings, but to carry into practical efficacy the old law with certainty of action. Under this Act 52 ecclesiastical surveyors have been appointed by the archdeacons and rural deans in the several dioceses of England and Wales.

As soon as practicable after their appointment, the ecclesiastical surveyors formed themselves into an association for mutual counsel, to ensure uniformity of practice throughout both provinces.

By the courtesy of the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, the first and second meetings of the association were held in the Board Room of the Bounty Office, when their able secretary and treasurer, Mr J. K. Aston (at the request of the association), gave his valuable legal services upon the new duties the Act imposed upon the governors; thus, at starting, accidental conflict with the Bounty Office was avoided.

The Ecclesiastical Surveyors' Association holds frequent meetings in London, where questions of doubt or difficulty are received from any part of either province for discussion; if necessary they are adjourned, printed, sent to every surveyor, legal opinions taken thereon, then re-discussed at a subsequent meeting; when a decision has been arrived at, it is sent to every surveyor for his guidance. The following questions may be cited as samples that have been so dealt with; viz.:—

Q. Where tuck pointing on brickwork is decayed, can an incumbent be called on to restore it?

A. No; tuck pointing being simply a matter of ornament, but ordinary pointing, necessary for keeping out weather, is chargeable.

Q. When a hedge fence has in part disappeared, is it right to charge for its re-instatement?

A. Yes. There may, however, be cases in which the land would be improved for farming purposes by a division fence being grubbed, and re-instatement need not then be insisted on.

Q. Who is responsible for the repair of a stile over a public path where the fence belongs to the glebe?

A. The incumbent; except in cases where it is customary for the road surveyor to maintain it.

Forms of notices and certificates under the Act have, with the aid of the Bishops' secretaries, been settled.

The Association is now engaged upon a tedious and laborious work. It has obtained from each of its members two copies of reports with specifications made in ordinary course; these are being carefully abstracted and tabulated for the purpose of producing a model report and specification, so that local peculiarities of technicology and custom may as much as possible be reduced to uniformity of practice.

It is sometimes alleged that "The Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, 1871" imposes new hardships upon the clergy; no doubt, to the present generation of clergymen the Act will occasionally press disagreeably: but (subject to the principle in Wise *v.* Metcalf) the surveyor can, to some extent, mollify the pressure of the Act in certain cases.

There is, however, a very serious hardship that the surveyor cannot reduce in intensity, although it, more than any other cause, has tended to make the Act unpopular; viz., when the Act was passed in 1871 Europe was disturbed by a gigantic war. While prices were rising, strikes in the mining districts disorganised all productions into which coal entered; thus lime, bricks, glass, metals, and other building materials, and their carriage, increased in cost to an amount incredible by persons unconnected with building operations. The incidence of this pressure was well stated by the chairman at the half-yearly meeting of the Midland Railway Company held at Derby, 17th August 1875, as follows:—

"At the present time, the construction of all new railways was very much more costly than a few years ago. Lines which had been constructed at a cost of £30,000 per mile, would now cost from £45,000 to £50,000. They must add at least fifty per cent. to the cost of construction at the present time as compared with six years ago."

An umpire in a secular dispute feels sure he has acted justly, when he learns that his award has equally offended both sides. This axiom applies forcibly to an ecclesiastical surveyor. The outgoing incumbent objects to the heavy demand he alleges is made upon him, while the new incumbent complains that he expected much more than the surveyor awarded him; so, all the assumed hardship under the Act does not press on one side only; he who is called upon to pay, protests more vehemently than he who receives; hence the public are led to believe he is a suffering victim.

But take a case as a fair type of a class with which surveyors are familiar: a non-resident rector with a stipend of £800 a year, held a benefice for twenty years, while a curate at £100 a year lived in the rectory house;

the rector died leaving heavy legacies; upon a survey it is found that the residence house, chancel, farm-buildings, fences and gates, are in a dilapidated and almost ruinous condition; the patron after due consideration presents a needy hardworking curate to the benefice. Is not he subjected to a great hardship upon entering this wilderness, if the surveyor does not estimate the dilapidations at the full value which a respectable builder would charge for executing the necessary work in a substantial manner?

Lord Romilly said in a recent important case, "The arbitrator was obliged to treat many hardly; it was due to those who had to receive, that everything should be demanded from those who had to pay."

As soon as the new incumbent finishes the repairs which are necessary to make good the neglect of his predecessor, he can demand from the surveyor a certificate of protection for five years. The question naturally arises, How can the surveyor grant the certificate if the work be not done? and how can the work be done if, from want of vigilance, he neglected to demand a sufficient sum in these times of high prices, or if from inability, the late incumbent paid nothing?

This difficulty might be met if the Bounty Board would reconsider and relax their rules which in this matter press with unnecessary harshness upon the poorer clergy. Section 38 of the Act of 1871, and section 1 of the Act of 1872, were framed purposely to enable an incumbent to borrow money for repairs upon the security of the possessions of the benefice for a term of years to be agreed upon, but the Bounty Board refuse to render the aid herein that in many instances would be of service. Another grievance caused by a Bounty Board regulation may be illustrated by a case that came under my own notice: a new incumbent took possession of a benefice at much personal expense and inconvenience, for the purpose of waking up two centuries of torpor in a parochial valley of dry bones. The parsonage had been converted out of two old cottages, and was repulsive to modern civilisation. Finding the Bounty Board would not lend him money for repairs, he asked for a loan to be applied in rebuilding and substantially improving part of the parsonage. The Bishop and patron consented, but the Board refused a loan, upon the plea, that as the benefice was worth only £100 a year, the incumbent, if disabled by chronic infirmity, could not repay the annual instalment and interest of the loan, together with the stipend needful for a curate carrying on the Church services during his infirmity: this refined torture was applied to a healthy muscular Christian, and is here made public, with a view of inducing the Bounty Board to temper justice with mercy.

In parishes having glebe farms, section 58 gives considerable relief to the clergy, if they will grant leases for fourteen years to their tenants, known as "Bishops' Leases." All buildings included in a Bishop's lease are free from any claim for dilapidations. If this section be carefully studied and wisely acted upon, it will be found to be of the greatest importance. In an ordinary case, a lay tenant is only bound as between himself and the incumbent to repair the buildings upon a glebe farm as upon any secular estate; but the incumbent is bound as between himself and the Bishop to repair the buildings upon the principle in Wise. *v.* Metcalf. Now, if a Bishop's lease be carefully drawn with reference to the Act of 1871, the tenant can be placed under precisely the same obliga-

tions to the incumbent with regard to the amount of repairs needed, as the incumbent is to the Bishop, and the ecclestiastical surveyor (upon the request of the incumbent or archdeacon) can call upon the tenant to repair, instead of the incumbent, and can have jurisdiction over the method of husbandry adopted, and the condition of subsoil drains, so as to prevent the impoverishment of the land during the last years of the term created by the lease. An arbitration clause in the lease making the ecclesiastical surveyor, as a qualified impartial person, the sole arbitrator in case of any dispute or matter in difference, will effectually prevent litigation.

The greatest difficulty the surveyor meets with in entering upon the survey of a vacant benefice, is the general absence of terriers. He applies to a parish clerk who knows only that the parson kept all papers, and the parsonage house is now empty; he then searches the enclosure award, or tithe commutation award, if he can find either, or he inspects the parish poors-rate book if the overseer be at home; he next hunts up some old parochial factotum, and while taking down his oral tradition, the surveyor finds pieces of glebe in other parishes, and so the inquiry has to be repeated there. This state of things would not be tolerated for one day by any man who possessed property of his own, why should it continue from year to year as to Church property when the remedy is so simple?

At each episcopal visitation the clergy are requested to hand to the Bishop's registrar a terrier upon parchment, approved and signed at a parish meeting called for that purpose. No expense is involved in the matter, only a little care and trouble are required. Each visitation as it comes round affords an easy public way of correcting terriers by inserting additions, exchanges, or sales. It may be boldly affirmed that much property has been, and is being, lost to the Church for want of terriers; the need of them is greater now than ever, because "The Land Transfer Act," 1875 (38 and 39 Vict. cap. 87), enables a qualified title to be registered (sec. 9), and constitutes valid ownership from twenty years undisturbed possession (sec. 17). By way of example, in my own parish while churchwarden, I investigated parish records with a view of increasing (if possible) the vicar's stipend. I found land had been converted into money, the money lent on bonds, the parties dead, and principal and interest lost. Again, a railway was made, severing a glebe, the purchase money was paid to the vicar, and applied by him to his own purposes; he died, his executorship accounts are closed, and the land alienated for ever. Again, where a rector was non-resident, a parish map was in charge of a parishioner whose freehold abutted on glebe land; upon a field on the map has been written "*exchanged with rector;*" neither can any record of the exchange, nor the land for which it is alleged to be exchanged, be found; and so the present rector and his successors are ousted, nobody knows how. Triennial terriers would have prevented all these losses. It is respectfully hoped that their lordships the Bishops will be pleased to issue a pastoral upon the necessity of terriers being presented at their next visitations, and that any clergyman omitting as before to deliver his terrier be specially pressed to do so, and that an adjourned day be fixed for receiving terriers at the Bishop's registry. In case such a request of the Bishops be not as cheerfully obeyed as it ought to be, a clause should be inserted in the next Act

that may be passed to amend the Dilapidations Act, to compel the ecclesiastical surveyors to prepare terriers of parishes where there are none, at the expense of the incumbent so refusing to obey his Bishop.

It needs but a moment's reflection to see the advantages a surveyor would possess for making his survey with accuracy, where he entered a parish with a terrier, as compared with one where it takes more time for him to learn in a bungling way what he has to do, than it occupies to survey the property when found.

On the whole, the Act has worked well in the interest of the Church, and for the permanent improvement of Church property; but in case of further legislation the following suggestions are worthy of consideration:—

1. Lay rectors should, in the case of chancels, be amenable to the Act equally with incumbents.

2. That in cases of vacant benefices, treated under the Act, provision should be made for referring the question of fixtures to the diocesan surveyor, and in the event of his finding they belong to the late incumbent, that he should value the same, and the new incumbent be empowered to borrow the amount of such valuation from Queen Anne's Bounty, and purchase the fixtures, and thenceforth those fixtures, and all future fixtures, should belong to the benefice. Appeal from the diocesan surveyor's award to be provided, as in the case of repairs.

3. The five years protection should date from the Bishop's order.

4. Where there is no Bishop's lease, the surveyor should be required and empowered to survey the tenant's methods of cultivating glebe, as to whether the land is being impoverished, also as to under-drained land whether the drains are silting up, as they will in course of years.

5. The surveyor should be empowered to inspect repairs during progress, because bad work and materials may be covered up from view (*e.g.*, in drains, floors, roofs, partitions), which the surveyor cannot possibly see when all repairs have been fully completed.

6. It is advisable that the surveyor should be empowered by legislation to allot the glebe timber for sale, for effecting improvements to the glebe land, and for similarly applying the proceeds of it for repairs to the buildings, or for new buildings, whenever the surveyor shall find it available.

7. To prevent the erection of buildings in an inefficient manner, or such as are likely to become unduly burdensome to the benefice, or are incongruous with existing buildings, it should be required by law that every building to be newly erected, and every addition to existing buildings, shall be approved by the surveyor under the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act 1871, or by the surveyor to the Bounty Office, or to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

8. There should be one uniform scale of fees for the whole of England upon the principle of payment for amount of work done: a sliding scale as to acreage of glebe might be framed.

If the country clergy would plant timber trees in paddocks, odd corners, and other suitable parts of their glebe, so as not to injure arable land, their successors would in due course find an accumulating dilapidation fund at hand; a renewal of this kind of property should be created by planting a tree for every one felled.

One simple remedy nearly every clergyman possesses for freeing his family from the burden of dilapidations after his decease; viz., to request

the ecclesiastical surveyor to survey the premises, and report to him for his private information how much his executors would be called upon to pay if he died to-morrow. Upon ascertaining the amount, if he insure his life for a small increase thereon, he will feel rid of painful doubt and anxiety.

In conclusion, it may be observed that the ecclesiastical surveyors are duly impressed with a deep sense of the responsibility that rests upon them in working this new Act of Parliament. They are not satisfied with a merely perfunctory performance of their duty, but cheerfully incur self-imposed journies, labour, and expense, in the hope, that in some small degree, they may be privileged to serve the clergy, and permanently benefit the Church they revere.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. Dr Massingham, Vicar of St Paul's, Longport, Burslem.

That the parochial clergy should have suitable residences, so that they may reside in their parishes, and be ever convenient to their work, is generally admitted; and it is a subject of thankfulness that such facilities have been given, by diocesan societies, by various Acts of Parliament, by the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, and by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, for the erection of parsonage-houses, and for the diminution of non-residence.

Further, as such residences are not private property, but held by the parochial clergy in trust for their successors, in perpetuity, every incumbent ought to keep the glebe house in good repair, during his incumbency, so that it may be kept up, and handed on to his successor, suitable for the continuous occupation of the clergyman. Formerly, the operation of the law was so loose and uncertain, that there was nothing of uniformity, and no rule by which to decide. For instance, when entering upon an old vicarage, I was told by the surveyor that "the old building wanted pulling down and rebuilding altogether,—that, as it was insured it would be a great blessing if the building were accidentally burned down before any furniture were brought into it,—and that as £10 would put it in as good condition as my predecessor received it, *that* sum had been awarded;" so I had to spend £100 to make it at all satisfactory, and only received £10 towards it. *Now*, all is changed. The Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act of 1871 has come into force, and no one can say that its provisions are not sufficiently strict. Have we not gone to the other extreme of the pendulum? If those admitted to their benefices before the passing of the Act could have their glebes handed over to them in thorough repair, and have a fresh start, there would be little to complain of, except certain anomalies and *needless expenses*. The case of Trinity Church, Chesterfield, will show that these are most objectionable. The Rev. Melville Holmes called in the surveyor, February 16, 1875, and the report was sent in March 16. The rector resigned April 29, before receiving his final certificate. The surveyor then received notice May 6, in conformity with clause 24 of the Act, to survey again his own work, when £2, 18s. for dilapidations was certified as needful. The Rev. J. Morton, the new incumbent, died July 26, without his final certificate, so the surveyor received full fees for both inspections, from both incumbents; and by section 24, the Bishop can send the surveyor again. This is monstrous. The diocese

of Lichfield has a lower scale of fees than most other dioceses, yet Bishop Abraham testified that he knew of several cases where the new incumbent received sums under £20 for dilapidations, and even as low as 16s., and had to pay the surveyor £12 or more for his double survey!! Another clergyman, assessed at some £14 for dilapidations, had to pay fees amounting to £11, 17s. 6d.

On leaving an old vicarage £178 had to be expended in putting it in complete order for a successor. On entering upon a new one, what did the incoming incumbent find? That after the two months allowed for the widow to occupy the parsonage house of the deceased, a large sum had to be expended—still, when this was done, the diocesan surveyor was necessarily ordered to make the survey—and though the executors and administrators of the late incumbent were liable, yet the new incumbent was to pay to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, within six months from the date of the order, the whole sum stated in it as the cost of repairs, whether or not he had recovered it from his predecessor, or his executors. And the benefice may be sequestrated, if the amount be not thus paid. Here comes a great hardship. Take a case upon which I speak feelingly. A. B., removing to another benefice, had to provide £178, to put his old vicarage in a satisfactory state for his successor. Of course he expected the representatives of the deceased incumbent to put his future vicarage in a similar condition. But, the deceased incumbent had died insolvent—the incoming incumbent cannot recover the dilapidations from his widow, so, after paying for the repairs of his *former* vicarage, he had to pay also for his *future* one,—and with expenses of removal, and fitting up, the new incumbent finds himself saddled with an immediate outlay of £500 or £600, which, to the bulk of the clergy, means difficulty and embarassment; and consequent anxiety, distraction of thought from sacred duties, and therefore, harm to the Church of England. Is there no way of escape from such a dilemma? To the few and wealthy of the clergy, this may not be a serious matter; but to the many, who have limited means, it *is* a serious matter, and it is as the representative of such, I would now earnestly plead for a few minutes. Those who are set apart for sacred duties should be as free as possible from anxieties about temporal things; and there are numbers of the clergy who would be quite different men in their pulpits and parishes, if relieved from such anxiety. Is it then fitting that an incumbent, just appointed to a new charge, should be filled with anxious thoughts as to how the expenses necessary by the Dilapidations Act can possibly be met, and fears as to sequestration in consequence?

Our Reformed Church favours a married clergy, who, unlike the monks, dwelling in monasteries, require glebe-houses or parsonages. And those parsonages ought certainly to be maintained in full efficiency, as fit residences. How can this be done, without pressing unduly upon individual clergymen? If we form a corporate body, and realise the communion of saints, then, if one member of the body corporate suffers, other members should sympathise with it; and then there would also be a common action, and a common effort. In this way, a mutual provision might be made, as a benefit to the diocese at large, at a small cost to every beneficed clergyman. The plan I am about to submit to you would be hailed by none more gladly than by the chief pastor of this diocese, who, both in New Zealand and in the diocese of Lichfield, has distinguished himself for administrative abilities. Were the plan carried out, much good must result, and much gnawing anxiety be saved. What is this plan?

But before I enter upon it, let me say that the present Act is very different to that which was first contemplated. *Then*, it was to be left in the hands of the archdeacons, who would have thus had some real archidiaconal functions to dis-

charge, and would have done their work without fees,—but now, the word "*bishop*" has been consistently put in the place of "*archdeacon*," and this, of course, means *the bishop's secretary*, who always has (naturally enough) an eye to the fees to be derived from the clergy.

It is also no easy thing to secure the necessary qualifications in a diocesan surveyor who holds a monopoly. He may be very good in planning out a town-house, and in his professional work generally, and yet know little about the requirements of rural benefices. The parochial clergy, who have to pay the diocesan surveyor, have really no voice in the selection or dismissal of the official who so greatly enforces the Act. A clerical friend in the South of England wrote to me as follows :—"I have suffered severely from that iniquitous Dilapidations Act, which deprived me of at least £250, that I should have received under any fair system, and which amount the executors of my predecessor fully expected to pay. In glancing at a synopsis of the Act in our Diocesan Calendar, I notice the word *fee* in twenty-one places!! with the comfortable prospect of *sequestration* of the living by the Bishop in case of refusal to pay all their exorbitant exactions. If the Act is to continue in its present form, the least we can expect is competent surveyors,—not flashy architects, who know as much of agricultural buildings and fences as the cattle and pigs who require them."

Then, as to the manner in which the diocesan surveyor is to be paid, I think there can be no doubt as to the better plan. He should be paid, not by fees, but by a fixed salary.

At present, where the parsonage-houses are kept in good repair, and the protective certificate is desired, what would be the cost, including the threefold fees payable to the surveyor, the secretary, and the registrar? The diocesan surveyor comes to inspect, and may order repairs, in all, not exceeding £12. But when these repairs are done, the official fees will generally be as follows :—

The surveyor for his report	£5	5	0
Do for his certificate	2	2	0
The secretary	2	2	0
The registrar	2	2	0
	£11	11	0

i.e., within a fraction of 100 per cent. on the outlay. Can anything be said to justify such a monstrous infliction? Should not an immediate effort be made to secure the repeal of that clause (Section XI.) which does not allow the surveyor to be paid by a fixed salary, and in its stead to substitute a clause that the surveyor should be paid a fixed salary, not exceeding £500 a year,—to be paid by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners out of their common fund,—and that a small fee should be paid to the secretaries and registrars for each transaction? If an inspection of all parsonage-houses was rendered compulsory, free of all cost to the clergy, or at a small charge, then no very great arrears as to dilapidations would be possible, and any great deterioration as to the property prevented.

It is most important, both for the one who vacates a living, and for the incoming incumbent, that each beneficed clergyman should avail himself of the protective certificate of the surveyor; and the unreasonable and exorbitant fees now generally charged by the diocesan officials is a great hindrance to this. As the new incumbent is made liable for all repairs ordered, and the whole responsibility of recovering the costs from the late incumbent, his executors or administrators, there can be little doubt that, wherever possible, the payment for dilapidations will be strictly exacted

from the representatives of deceased incumbents, as the provisions of the Act must then come into force.

What can be done to relieve the widows of the distressing anxiety that will often result? and the younger clergy appointed to small benefices from being greatly involved by liabilities for ecclesiastical dilapidations, resulting from the carelessness or inability of their predecessors, but which may fall with such crushing severity upon those appointed to livings, as to injure their usefulness, and to distract their attention from the spiritual work of the parish?

The 54th section makes it necessary for the incumbent of every benefice to insure, and keep insured, against loss or damage by fire, the house of residence, and farm and other buildings, and the outbuildings and offices.

If we insure against the *occasional* damage which may result from fire, why not also insure against the *regular and continuous damage* resulting from necessary wear and tear and exposure to the atmosphere?

From an address of our reverend Bishop, I learn that a *pro rata* scale of £1 a year would raise the sum of £1800 from this diocese alone, and, by a mutual insurance fund with the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, a compulsory percentage on the rateable value of the glebe-house might provide for all necessary outlay for dilapidations.

At a meeting of Rural Deans, July 24th, the Bishop of Lichfield showed that the present cost of surveying in this diocese was more than £1600 per annum. If the suggestion as to the payment of officials from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Fund were carried out, this would go far towards a nucleus for a mutual insurance fund; and as one surveyor could take the oversight of three or four dioceses, a reasonable amount from each would suffice. A scheme that is never accepted by incumbents except upon compulsion cannot work well, and whatever payments are required for dilapidations should be uniformly distributed, and be made during the lifetime of incumbents, so as not to harass the widow and the fatherless.

A Wesleyan minister is under no anxiety as to his house of residence—all the expenses are met from a common fund; why should the clergy be so often harassed by ecclesiastical dilapidations?

As it stands, the Dilapidations Act involves so much risk and so certain an expense, that however unreasonable an assessment may be, the clergyman had better submit to it. For suppose he appeals against the assessment, what then? If the appellant should succeed in his appeal, the opposing defendant cannot be made liable for any costs—so that the appellant may even then have to pay the costs of three different surveyors; for, in the first place, there is the costs of the diocesan surveyor's survey, against which he appeals—then there is the private surveyor called in on his own account, and of course at his own cost, for the purpose of formally making his appeal—and then there is the surveyor nominated by the bishop, to whom the appeal is made, and by whom the final decision is given. Perhaps another diocesan surveyor may be called in. I have been told, as a fact, that a bishop actually applied to the very diocesan surveyor of his diocese, whose assessment was appealed against, to name the person who should be employed to review his survey and report. What could be expected in such a case? And if it be true that the diocesan surveyors appointed under the Act are banded together in an association for mutual advice and support, and not to lower any estimate given in, may not the result of any such appeal be readily foreseen and estimated? He is almost certain to fail: and even should he succeed, in any case the whole costs of the three surveys would fall upon the beneficed clergyman who appeals. What is this but a serious reality of the

childish game, "Heads, I win; tails, you lose?" Such a system cannot be defended.

Whether the surveyor be too careless or too exacting,—whether the estimate and works ordered be too high or too low,—whether the charges imposed be just or unjust,—whether sufficient time be given for the survey, or whether it be so hurriedly done as to be insufficient and unsatisfactory,—the clergyman feels it better to submit than incur further expense. And yet, is it not possible and probable that a surveyor may sometimes go from his house, many miles distant,—be anxious to catch as early a train home as possible,—hurry through his work by a somewhat hasty and superficial view of things,—give in to the Bishop and others a copy of works required to be done, which are ordered by the Bishop,—but when the incoming clergyman has entered upon his benefice, and examined into the real state of the glebe property, he finds that where a barn or stable had formerly existed, there is no longer any, because the former incumbent saw them getting into a dilapidated condition, and left no vestige of them, lest they should form a heavy dilapidation charge,—so the property was deteriorated, the outbuildings pulled down, the timbers burnt, and the brick and stones used for other purposes, as to make a roadway.

The diocesan surveyor, also, only gives a total estimate for the whole; as the detailed expense of each item is not separately given, it is not easy to see in which department there is a too heavy amount; and *this* makes it the more difficult to appeal against the survey. As the surveyor must apportion the proper value to each separate article in forming his own estimate, why should he not be required to give an assigned amount to each detail, for the information and satisfaction of all concerned?

In conclusion, I beg to submit that, in my opinion—(1.) We want such alterations in the Act as will reduce the present enormous expenditure. It has been shown (by the Rev. E. Walter, Rector of Langton, diocese of Lincoln) that *the fees alone* payable every five years under this Act for the Lincoln diocese amount to £33,165, and for the whole of the Church of England to £360,000.

(2.) We want a greater voice in the selection of a surveyor or surveyors, so long as we have to pay them.

(3.) We want the surveyor paid, not by fees, but by a regular stipend, from the general fund of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

(4.) We want a greater choice as to the surveyors, for surely in any county more than one competent and efficient man can be found worthy of the appointment.

(5.) We want more power for the clergy in making any Act which exclusively concerns themselves and their families. If the bishops and cathedral dignitaries can employ any surveyor satisfactory to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, why should not the clergy do the same generally?

(6.) And lastly, *most of all*, we want a scale of annual insurance, which, by continual and small payments from each and all, would free the clergy and their widows and orphans from the enormous and crushing occasional expenditure to which they are now unhappily liable.

DISCUSSION.

Mr Charles Lynam, Diocesan Surveyor, Lichfield.

First of all, I must reiterate the expression which my friend Mr Rowe has made, that the diocesan surveyors throughout the whole of England feel most deeply the heavy responsibility which attend their duties. In proof of this, Mr Rowe has told this meeting, that there is an association of all the surveyors, who meet in London at their own expense of

time and money, to discuss every single complaint that is made, and if possible to settle it in a manner uniform amongst the whole. Now I come to the only remark I wish to make on the papers read this morning, because the multitude of considerations, which have been thrown out, would require a most careful consideration and reply; and I hope that a reply will be forthcoming, and that it will be useful to every one who is interested in the details of this Act. The remark I have to make is simply that, if I understand Dr Frazer aright, he states positively that the old Dilapidation Act, and the present Dilapidation Act, differ the one from the other, that under the old system there was one law for dilapidations, and that under the new system there is another law. I ask Dr Frazer, or any one else, to point out in the new Act one single item altering the old dilapidation law. There is no alteration. What an incumbent was liable to before the passing of the recent Act he is still liable to; all the new Act has done is to institute officers, who shall see that the money paid for dilapidation shall be spent on the glebe for the benefit of those ministering in the Church. It is for that alone that this machinery has been set going. I might tell you of cases where it is absolutely necessary that such a machinery should be set going, and I have not a doubt, when the papers which have been read to-day have been answered, there will be a very different understanding on the matter than there is at this moment.

The Rev. Canon Tristram.

Having had a great deal of practical experience in the working of the present Act, I wish to say a few words as to the best means of meeting it. I have not heard in any of the papers a single word as to the repeal of this Act, but every one seems to agree that it requires great modifications. I can see that the evils under which we suffer would be remedied by some very slight corrections of the Act. In the first place, it has been admitted, in the first and second papers, that there is an ideal standard of perfection agreed upon by the architects, which practically is a very great hardship to the clergy. I was rather startled by hearing that there was no uniformity, because I have found practically, that in the three northern dioceses there is a standard of perfection, which in many cases is actually new. I think we ought to have some alteration of the Act, which would enable a reasonable waste which is not wilful to be recognised. In the diocese from which I come we have appointed the best ecclesiastical architect in the north of England; but it rather pains me to see such a man sent to inspect farm buildings, hedges, and gate posts, which could be done perfectly well by one who is not a professional architect. This ideal perfection works in this way—to give just an instance: A house in the diocese of Carlisle had a settlement some twenty-five years ago, which had cracked the stone window-sills. The crack was an eighth of an inch in width, and the architect who ordered the sills to be replaced at a cost of, or something like, £27, admitted that it was not as good a job as it was before, but he was obliged to have the house put in perfect repair. No doubt the architect acted with perfect consistency, and according to his idea of perfection. The clergyman called in the surveyor of a neighbouring diocese on appeal, who confirmed and added to the former estimate. The Bishop of Carlisle felt the case was so very hard on the outgoing incumbent, that he exercised his power under the Act (and that I believe is the first time a Bishop has done so) and fell back upon the first award, leaving the clergyman to pay double fees only instead of paying as he might have done £20 extra, but for the kindness of his diocesan. Then I cannot see why the Bishop's secretary and the Registrar are to be fee'd. I have felt as one of a body of patrons very much pained at the panic-stricken way in which some clergymen are endeavouring to sell their Queen Anne's Bounty glebes in consequence of this Act. The reason given is the expense of keeping up these farms. When we consider what the land was bought for, that it now is paying something like from 50 to 75 per cent on the purchase money, I implore my brethren not to ruin their successors, in a moment of panic, in order to save themselves.

The Venerable Archdeacon Emery.

It is perhaps right that one who is both a member of Convocation and an archdeacon should say a few words upon this subject. I was asked to write a paper, but I thought the committee would act more wisely to ask some one else to do so, and I suggested Mr Rowe, knowing him to be engaged a good deal in the survey of dilapidations. Whatever our particular views on the subject may be, his paper is a very valuable paper. There is no doubt the old system of dealing with dilapidations caused great trouble and inconvenience to the clergy, and there was a loud demand for something to be done. Convocation undertook it; and as one of the committee, I may say we gave a great deal of attention to the subject. The first suggestions we put forward in the shape of a bill were refused by the House of Lords, principally, I am told, from a jealousy of Convocation; in 1867 the Archbishop of York brought the bill forward again without mention of Convocation, and passed it with certain alterations. I deeply regret that his Grace should have struck out the word "archdeacon" and put in "bishop" in the bill. It seems to me the archdeacons ought to have been entrusted with the work, which possibly would have resulted in saving a great many fees. There is no doubt the present Act presses very hardly upon the present race of incumbents; still I do not think that it has been worked so easily as it might have been. Queen Anne's Bounty had a power of assisting here which it has not exercised. If the Act had been made to work more smoothly for the present, we should have avoided a great danger of permanent injury to the Church. If any amendments are made, I would have them take this direction—that the present assessment for this dilapidations should be divided between the outgoing incumbent, and a loan to be spread over a great many years upon the benefice. Then in course of time things would right themselves, and the new generation of incumbents would not feel very hardly pressed by it. Another thing I would suggest, and the clergy ought to press strongly for it, viz., that Queen Anne's Bounty be allowed to be an insurance office for the Church. The late Prime Minister said there was a great deal to be said for that suggestion, but the present insurance societies have been sufficient hitherto to burke it. The Act requires all our buildings to be insured, and it is capable I believe of proof that if Queen Anne's Bounty were allowed to be a Fire Insurance Office for the Church, we might cover all or a great part of the expenses of the survey, and the Church might probably get even a large sum to assist in promoting the original objects of that society. Therefore I should like the clergy as a body throughout the country to say, and I am convinced the honest and earnest laity will join us in saying, Let the Church do for itself what other bodies are allowed to do. Once more, I consider this question of a terrier is very important. Many of my brethren of the clergy are too much inclined to go on rather a happy-go-lucky system on this matter. We want a correct terrier made out for every parish. A great deal of property is probably lost because the sub-terriers do not exist; and one advantage of this Act is, that the surveyors are paying great attention to this point, so that the next generation of clergy will benefit thereby. I trust these deliberations will assist in amending the Act, and making it work more smoothly for many incumbents who are hard pressed by it. To help to this end it would be very desirable to form a voluntary committee of clergy and laity interested in this subject, for the purpose of gathering up facts and making suggestions to the Committee of Convocation and the committee of surveyors of dilapidations.

Rev. C. F. C. Pigott, Rural Dean, Rector of Edgmond, Salop.

I come before you somewhat in the character of a vivisected rector, to use Dr Frazer's expression, for I have placed myself under the operation of this Act. The whole expense of surveying, with the certificate, came to over £26, my buildings being extensive. In my innocence I had calculated on seven or eight guineas; but I had no right to complain, for I was one of the officials connected with the settlement of the fees; and from inexperience

there was a good deal of blundering, which, no doubt, will soon be set right. The surveyor did his work well, and simply availed himself of the terms allowed him. I believe when the Act is better understood and properly administered, it will be appreciated as a great boon, especially to the poorer clergy. The old law has received a very bad character from the various speakers, and the new may be compared with the old to the great advantage of the former. Under the old law a clergyman who allowed his buildings to fall into disrepair was liable to a criminal prosecution, and almost anybody might proceed against him. Prosecutions were infrequent, but now the aggrieved parishioner has been created, and we know not what might happen. A much milder process comes in under the new Act. If a clergyman allows his buildings, *i.e.*, the property of the Church, to fall into decay, the Bishop is directed by the Act to write and admonish him to put them in repair. If he consents and does it, the matter is at an end. If he refuses, the new law may be put in force against him, as might the old law in the previous state of things. But in the new it was a civil process; in the old it is a criminal one. I need not say which is best for us. Of course, on the avoidance of a benefice, a survey is necessary, both under the old law and the new. What makes the new Act unpopular is, first, its not being yet understood; next the great increase of late in the expense of building. Further, the surveyor's fees have not yet been put on the moderate footing which they will soon occupy. I feel sure when this is done (and it will be done soon), the average cost of the surveyor will be, I have no doubt, from six to eight guineas. This will be all a clergyman will have to pay for inspection during the whole tenure of his benefice, except in the rarest cases. He may of course call in the surveyor, if he likes, every five years; but the Act does not require this, except in sequestrated benefices. But the great boon it gives to the poorer clergy is the privilege of borrowing for their repairs, and charging the loan on the benefice. English law has never, I believe, given this boon to tenants for life before. Land owners being tenants for life can borrow money at 5 per cent. to drain and build, but never to repair. English law has been greatly stretched in this Act to benefit the poorer clergy, and the Act requires that they shall not be charged more than 4 per cent. for a loan. It is a great boon, especially to a poor man entering on a benefice with many expenses in furnishing, &c. Let us make this power to borrow a full reality by bringing pressure to bear on the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty. But let us not be led astray from our own interests by persons unacquainted with the Act. There will presently be a reaction in its favour, when it comes to be duly administered. For my part, I greatly admire its main provisions.

Rev. D. Mountfield, M.A., Rector of Newport, Salop.

Notwithstanding what has been said by some of the preceding speakers, I do not think that it is necessary for me to occupy your time by attempting to prove that this Act is unnecessary, costly, cumbrous, and oppressive to the parochial clergy of England. I take that for granted, and I shall state briefly the chief alterations which we need. Although this Act has been in existence four years, only 217 clergymen are reported as having availed themselves of it; and that notwithstanding the great inducements it offers to us in protecting our widows and children. The first alteration, I think, should be that the appointment, method, and amount of payment, of surveyors, should be in the hands of the parochial clergy, who are now excluded from all voice in the administration of the Act. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer says, if you want good results, you must seek the active co-operation of all those interested; and the Archbishop of York has, I imagine, no objection to give the clergy a voice in the matter. They who pay the piper have a right to choose the tune. In the second place, we want power to appoint at any time as many surveyors as the clergy may think desirable. We are suffering great injustice from the monopoly which has been created, but which is the fault of unskilful administration of the Act. A man who resides twenty or thirty miles away from us, is appointed to survey our buildings, and we are obliged to call him in, when there is one close to our doors, as competent and

willing to survey our premises, at one half the cost. Neither has this monopoly secured efficiency. In this diocese there are cases standing over from 1872, 1873, and 1874, still unreported upon; so that the monopoly has secured neither efficiency nor economy. Thirdly, we want dilapidations to be defined, not by the surveyor privately in London, but so that all should know what are dilapidations, and we want them to be divided into two classes. Tenant's repairs ought to be charged on the incumbent as tenant for life; and landlord's repairs should be met by a charge on the benefice spread over many years. It is not equitable that a tenant should be held responsible for repairs, which are rendered necessary through the unavoidable decay of time and weather. Lastly, we want another Court of Appeal. The Bishops have not necessarily requisite knowledge, and they have not the time to go through surveyor's reports. We therefore wish that a commission should be appointed by the Bishop to hear objections to the surveyor's report, who should inquire into the whole case, and report to the Bishop. The position of the clergy is extremely hard. The surveyor may be quite wrong, and the objector quite right, but the former suffers nothing, the latter pays all expenses. Parliament, I believe, is well disposed to the parochial clergy, and with regard to the Bishops who are supposed to be the authors of this Act, they did not mean ill. It has produced effects which they did not anticipate, and certainly did not design. After all they are our brethren; and though they have made a mistake, will be found not unwilling to rectify it. And I hope the estrangement between the Bishops and clergy, to which allusion has been made, will not arise on account of the Dilapidation Act of 1871.

Rev. Denham R. Norman, Rector of Stafford.

I also am something like the vivisected animal spoken of by Dr Frazer. Not only have I had the lance put very keenly into me, but, on coming to Stafford, I found myself houseless. I am not, however, going to growl, but I simply want to make a single suggestion. I believe, at the present moment, in the diocese of Lichfield there are a great many groaners, but there need not have been. I contend that before a man accepts a benefice, he ought to know what his liabilities are likely to be; and the suggestion I would make is that before a benefice is offered to any man, the diocesan surveyor should have made his report, and the man should know what he has to receive for dilapidations before he says Yes or No to the patron. Very often a young man who wants to get married, receives a tempting offer of a pretty little benefice, a nice comfortable place, where love may be in a cottage perhaps; and after a little while he goes down and finds the house is in a very shaky state, and that there are only £10 or £12 awarded to him for putting it into repair. If my suggestions were adopted, a great many heart-burnings would be prevented. A man would be able to see whether the sum he was to receive from his predecessor was sufficient to put the house into repair, and he could then tell his patron Yes or No. I want to bear out what Mr Lyman said that the diocesan officers have a very difficult part to play; but if the archdeacons had in time past done their duty, we should not have had this legacy of misery and heart-burnings which we have. If the archdeacons had not been so bland and affable, if they had not gone to parsonages and taken their glass of sherry, and said nothing about this subject of dilapidation; but if they had simply done their duty as they ought to have done, these difficulties would not have existed. I say that the officials of the Church are to blame for these miserable old houses which we have. Do not let us think we have heard the last of this business. I think it only right to tell these officers of the Bishops to their faces, that if they had done their duty, if they had been a little more firm and just, we should not have needed to go to Parliament for this Act.

FREE AND OPEN CHURCHES.

PAPERS.

The Dean of York.

The question of free and open churches has diminished neither in interest nor importance, notwithstanding other and more exciting controversies of the age, and I beg leave to congratulate the members of this Church Congress on the subject having been formally and officially recognised, and placed on the category for papers and discussion.

When the population of England is increasing with incredible rapidity, and when the question meets us on all sides, How shall we most effectually reach the masses with spiritual ministrations? the question of free and unappropriated churches presses for consideration difficult to resist. In early times churches were principally, if not wholly, free. They consisted of a nave, aisles, and at the east end of the nave a semicircular apse; when the change took place from the plan of a basilica to that of a Saxon or other early church, is not very clear; but in England the apse disappeared, and so completely, that amongst the vast numbers of old parish churches still existing, it is said that there are to be found only about forty with apses, and of these a very small proportion date more recently than the twelfth century. In ordinary parish churches the clergy were provided with a sedile, cut in the south wall of the chancel; usually there were three such sedilia, for the priest, deacon, and subdeacon. At this time we find no seats or other similar provision for the accommodation of the congregation. Occasionally a stone bench ran round the north, south, and west walls, and I am told that there is an instance of a stone bench running round each of the pillars. With the exception of a canon, made by the Diocesan Synod of Exeter in 1287, denouncing the conduct of persons claiming exclusive right to particular seats, we find in England no recognised sitting accommodation for the congregation before the 14th century; a sitting posture in church would have been considered a novelty. I may observe that porches were generally fitted with a stone bench down each side, that people might rest themselves previous to the service. It is evident that the general fitting of churches with benches is of later date. These benches were at first of massive structure, but were movable, for in 1464 there is an entry for payment in the accounts of St Michael's Church, Cornhill, of carriage to and fro, and another payment for cleansing the dust, which had accumulated beneath these seats. In 1493 there was an action for trespass; the people complained that they could not have their *standing*, by reason of such seats in the church. The action was brought for breaking and carrying away the seat of the plaintiff, but the judge held that "if one does not hold such a seat by prescription, the claim cannot be good, for the church is common to all." Bishop Bentham, in his Coventry and Lichfield visitation articles in 1565, directs "that you daily call upon the people to come to the church upon the Sabbath-day in due time, and there to occupy themselves in devout prayer, in the time of divine service, and not to walk up and down in the church, nor to jangle, babble, nor talk in service time." This would

seem to indicate that the churches were only very partially fitted with seats in the middle of the 16th century, or there would not have been much space left for walking up and down. From this time, however, seats became more general, and the pew system may be dated. It is recorded of the Chancellor, Sir T. Moore, "Upon the holie days, during his high Chancellorship, one of his gentlemen, when service at the church was donne, ordinarilie used to come to my ladie, his wife's pue dore, and saie unto her, My lord is gone. The next holie daie after the surrender of his office, and the departure of his gentlemen from him, he came unto my ladie, his wife's pue himself, and making a courtesie, said unto her, Madam, my lord is gone, but she, thinking this at first to be but one of his jests, was little moved, till he told her sadly he had given up the great seele."

With the spread of the pew system, a money payment came into existence, in the shape of pew rents; in the account of the churchwarden of St Margaret, Westminster, is a charge of 6s. 8d. to Sir Hugh Vaughan, knight, for his part of a pew, and again, there is received of Knyght, the courtgei of his wife's pew 2s. Happily, however, the instances, even in those days, were not sufficient to support a legalisation of pew rents. With the establishment of pews and pew rents, another evil arose. Certain persons imagined that because they and their predecessors had for a long period of time occupied the same pew, they had acquired a freehold right, and that such property could be bought and sold. On one occasion an auctioneer with dry gravity thus addressed his audience :—"If all the ocean were ink, and all the forests pens, and all the men and women writers, and a scroll was to reach from sky to sky, it could not contain all the advantages of the pew I now offer for competition, amongst which the greatest is, the opportunity it affords of listening to the chaplain of Lord ——, who has left more brilliant scenes for the sake of converting us heathen." He added, after a pause, "There is one convert already," seeing a Quaker stand up to bid. Thus did the pew system grow into life—the giving of ecclesiastic privileges according to social rank, or for a money payment, or by becoming a Quaker's-tenant, at first, to the disadvantage, then to the exclusion, of many, and frequently of an immense majority of the parishioners—has become a very grave question. It attracts general attention, and it may prove to be of vital importance to the whole Church of England. Let me for a moment take this audience to the metropolitan city of this kingdom. I have in my possession a list of seventeen London parishes, containing 200,000 souls. Five of these parishes have free and open churches; one church, the parish of which contains 14,800 souls, has no free sittings, and the remaining have about 5000 free sittings for this mass of people.

Let me add the observation of one who speaks from experience :—"On Sunday I went to the parish church, accompanied by a friend; ten minutes before the service, we found it all but empty, the scant provision made for the poor in the centre passage was all filled, and we turned into the free seats under the west gallery. A description of these will be interesting. It was a curious little enclosure, separated entirely from the more fashionable portion of the church. The seat was from eight to nine inches wide, the back of the adjoining seat was so close, we were obliged to keep our knees wide apart, and when we knelt, we underwent no ordinary penance."

I ask, are such regulations likely to impress on the working classes, that they are welcome in their parish church? This is, in truth, the state of the case. An edifice, reared by the munificence of a former age, is the parish church—the church of the parishioners, rich and poor alike. For each and for all, it is opened for public worship. Each parishioner has equally a common law-right to a seat in his parish church, and yet the right is enjoyed only by few. In our large towns, and it is of these I am principally speaking, the greater part of the parishioners enjoy no such right, and it is not surprising if they seem to become indifferent. The churches have become the property of the rich, and have no place for the poor. The pew system and pew rents have virtually closed the church against the poor—have done much to alienate the working classes. It has, however, been alleged, that if pews and pew rents alienate the poorer parishioners, free and open churches alienate the higher classes. My experience leads to no such conclusion. How is it that free and unappropriated churches are filled in a way, which is not often seen in appropriated churches; how is it, that All Saints, Margaret Street, overflows, whilst St George's, Hanover Square, is comparatively speaking, deserted? how is it, that the high, and the highest in the land worship at the former, and mingle without reserve with their humbler fellow subjects? how is it that, within the walls of All Saints, rich and poor meet together and present the very essence of public worship? If ever there was a time when free and unappropriated churches should be encouraged, that time is the present. Men can no longer be compelled to attend their parish church. A hard and fast line can no longer be drawn round each parish. The varieties of taste and opinion, the facilities of locomotion, the impossibility of rigid uniformity, and the attraction of ornate services, render public worship no longer parochial. If therefore the people crowd into free and unappropriated churches, where the services are hearty and attractive, to the exclusion of parishioners, if there is, as has been said, a "general surging" into such churches, the intruders may say, that they in their turn are excluded from their own churches by appropriation. And the real remedy will be to make more churches free, more services attractive, a more elastic system, and thus to disarm those, who now wander, and who excuse themselves under the plea, that they are either excluded from their own parish church, or else are relegated to remote corners. "Is it too much to say," asks one who is no mean authority, "that people, who with infinite pains and anxious care have been led from the gin shop to the street sermon, from the street to the mission room, from the mission room to the class, and at last to the church, and who find there a more selfish state of things than they found in the mission room, may receive wounds to their souls, which will never more be healed—

"To have been told, that worship in its fulness is what they should render, that to take their place with the great congregation, is to enter the ranks of the more privileged and advanced, and then to find, the more identified as brethren they become, the less the welcome as brethren they receive."

To be the centre of light and life, to evangelise the masses of our countrymen, to do the important work of moulding the religion of the people, the churches of the land must be free; all that is symbolised by the pew system must be given up; and we may say, and that with thankfulness, that the

principle of the free church is every year more and more recognised. Such churches are multiplying throughout the land, and are one more of those many evidences at this moment of increased religious life, and of a deepening sense of individual responsibility. I am not unaware, that this question is regarded as part of a system which finds little favour with some persons, and is looked upon with suspicion by others. But I desire to advocate nothing but what the Church of England teaches, and what a fair interpretation of the prayer-book gives. I do not believe in the alienation of the laity. My experience tells me, that the Church of England is strong in the affections of the laity, and that when properly instructed, the laity are thirsting for Church teaching, and thankfully accept Church privileges.

I believe in ornament, in stateliness in our churches, in freedom of worship, and in services conducted with reverence and decorum. It is the absence of these which has driven away our middle-class laity, and I am thankful to read, that a committee of the present House of Commons has recently reported, that "whilst it is desirable to maintain the parochial system in active vigour, and also to avoid every needless interference with the privileges of incumbents, it is no less desirable to recognise the claims of laymen to the further spiritual ministrations which they need and desire to obtain."

The three-decker, the old-fashioned perfunctory service, the duet between the incumbent and the clerk, whilst the heads of the congregation are just visible above the high-sided pew, will soon belong to another age. They are not yet, however, quite unknown. On the 20th of last June, being observed as the day of the Queen's Ascension, a service of this kind occurred. The clerk read the verse, "Blessed be the name of His Majesty for ever," and then thinking there was something wrong, hesitated and concluded, in a manner which left no doubt of his loyalty. "All, all the earth shall be filled with Her Majesty. Amen, amen."

That the position of the Church, owing to her transition state, is not an unanxious one, few persons will probably deny; but we are in the hands of One who overrules all things for good; and if it should please Him, that we, in this our day and generation, should be instruments in His hands for the development of religious energies, and to testify in all its reality to that deposit which we have received from Himself; if we may affirm that notwithstanding our difficulties and differences, we have received gifts during the last twenty-five years, such as have seldom been bestowed on any religious community; if we can appeal to deepened spiritual life, to a transformed and an energetic clergy, to a laity not alienated, but less cold and less indifferent than formerly, and nobly responding to efforts made by a faithful clergy; if we can point to education vigorously pushed, to churches free and open and well-ordered, to congregations manifesting reverence and decorum, to increased and increasing communicants, to the restoration of the true glory and beauty of the sanctuary, and in their full comprehensiveness and heartiness to the touching congregational services of the Church of England, surely we may say, that the work is God's work, that it has been signally blessed, and future ages will say that we did not wholly live in vain, nor labour in vain, but they will add, and we must add, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give all the praise."

The Right Hon. the Earl of Shrewsbury.

Considerations which I will shortly narrate have induced me to offer a paper to the Church Congress on this occasion, firstly, because I thought that such an important subject was again well worthy of notice, and that the work of the Congress would hardly be complete if so interesting a topic should be left out of the list. I confess that though I have undertaken the task, I approach the subject with great diffidence, and were it not that I had had the honour of presiding over the National Association for the Freedom of Worship, which has its station in Manchester, and that I endeavoured, though without success, in the years 1871 and 1872, to effect a union between the Society which existed in Manchester and the London Societies then presided over by Lords Wharncliffe and Nelson (and thus may have gained some information) I should be afraid of my powers to treat the matter in a manner worthy of the cause. I do not purpose to allude in any way further to the controversy which arose from endeavours to secure this amalgamation, though I confess that in referring to the pamphlets and correspondence published at the time I think they are creditable to the energy and work of all the Societies, and have sufficed to prove without a doubt that there is the greatest interest taken in the Free and Open Church movement. That is the point which I wish specially to press upon this assembly; and knowing that I shall be followed by my friends Lord Nelson, Sir P. Heywood, and Mr Herford, I cannot but hope that any weakness in my statements may be strengthened by the arguments which I am sure they will bring forward. The subject is far too earnest a one for us to waste the time of the Congress in considering whether the various Societies should have amalgamated or ought to amalgamate. This is a matter of detail for the various Councils if they should so think fit; but what I consider of real importance is, that the work of the Free and Open Church movement should have the approval of this assembly, that it should go forth to the world that in the opinion of this great Church Congress, held at Stoke-on-Trent in 1875, the work was not only desirable but imperative upon us. I now proceed to offer you evidence in support of this statement, and I am glad to think that it is of so voluminous a nature that there will be no doubt of the facts that I have stated, and that, considering the means that we have had, our success has been such that we have only to persevere in our efforts to effect much more good. I cannot presume to weary you with statistics, but let me take at hap-hazard many of the reports that are before us. I quote from the Ninth Annual Report of the Free and Open Church Association at Norfolk Street, Strand, London, over which I presided last year. What does it say? This—and it is a glorious statement—that there are now in London and its suburbs 153 free churches, 295 churches with weekly offertory, and 123 churches open for private prayer. Further, it states that the members of the Society have increased, that the work of the Council has increased, and to get through that work many more meetings have to be held, that the applications for information are incessant, that it has been found necessary to very largely increase the publications of the Association, and that, irrespective of the monthly issue of the "Free and Open Church

Advocate," which has averaged 1500, the number printed has been upwards of 122,000. I leave the reports of the other Societies to speak for themselves, but I cannot but allude to a pamphlet just issued by the London Free and Open Church Association, which gives most valuable facts and opinions about some five hundred parishes in town and country, printed in a tabular form. It truly says that the movement in favour of free and open churches, though now so general, is still so far recent that the data of experience have not as yet been sufficiently collected. When the case had to be argued it was not possible to satisfy the English demand for "facts" till the conversion of some at all events had contributed to produce them. The experience must be by this time ample and varied enough, but no such effort has been made to gather up its results. The value of such results, making all allowances for drawbacks, is manifest. If they prove nothing else, they prove how wide-spread is the conviction that the pew system is the great hindrance to the Church's work. But they also prove that in all sorts and conditions of parishes it may be hopefully and even profitably removed. From a return made by the order of the House of Commons, in the year 1867, it appeared that by an analysis of the churches in the parish of Manchester (which happened to be just sixty-seven churches also in number) that the average pew rental of these—all town churches, and including rich suburban populations—was £184. In twenty-four cases it was under £100; in only ten cases over £300. As far back as 1866, the Rev. E. A. Sandford read a paper at Taunton in which he gave the results of experience from eighteen parishes selected from many others, as applicable to a deanery consisting mostly of country towns and small agricultural parishes. To an aggregate population of 25,884, we have a product of £2497, 6s. 1d., or an average of about £160 per church. In all cases but one the congregations had either not suffered (as was alleged to be the case) or had improved, and of the longest experience of all, dating from 1840, the incumbent is able to say:—"Not aware that any man, woman, or child, was ever kept away from church by it, confident that many love the public worship of God all the better for it." I cannot resist giving these figures, for facts always surpass argument. Referring to some statistics collected by the Chester Diocesan Association in 1869, the pamphlet goes on to say:—"Returns from a fair number of churches were obtained, of which fifty or sixty were published, fairly chosen, as types of various sorts and conditions, with a digest of the verbal testimony of the clergy. At that time thirty-nine churches gave an aggregate yield of £16,752, or upwards of £400 per church. In one case the amount nearly doubles when pew-rents, simply, are given up, and nearly doubles again when appropriation is abolished. In fifteen, where the comparison with former methods was made, the increase is from an aggregate of about £2000 to one of about £5500. In one case the expression is 'rose immediately from £40 to £200.' In seventeen churches there is an increase of attendance from 3100 to 4800, besides such as 'great increase,' 'doubled,' and 'three or four-fold,' and one remarkable case in which the communicants now double the former congregation." I make no apology for quoting these facts; they speak boldly for themselves, and only require permeating through society to make the movement more and more successful. I think I have clearly shown that wherever pew-rents are abolished, and the offertory introduced, the

income of the church is increased; and I believe I am correctly stating the law of the land, when I say that I believe that it is illegal for any part of the church to be assigned to the richer portion of the inhabitants of a parish, but that it equally belongs to the poor and rich alike, and that it is the duty of the churchwardens, as far as the accommodation of the church permits, to find places for all, irrespective of their position in society. It is not, however, my intention to dwell upon the legal question, doubtless it will be more fully treated by those who follow me. I, however, would say as a churchwarden, that a case occurred only the other day where a parishioner, a most regular attendant at worship, asked me to appropriate him a seat, as he was continually crowded out by both parishioners and non-parishioners, so that he and his family could not obtain a seat. The church has open seats, the pews having happily been done away with; but somehow or other, though it was intended to be free, the seats became appropriated to the hall, the establishment, certain farmers, and to the school children. The only possible way I can see to remedy such cases in the church I speak of is, to do away with the oak seats, and have chairs with cocoa-nut matting underneath them, so as to avoid noise; but the removal would be a considerable expense, and I do not think would be popular in the parish. I should say that formerly the pews were appropriated, but no rents paid for them. Another case of difficulty has come before me, where the belief in the parish exists that the pew belongs to the farm. I had some short time ago, when the pews were done away with in this church, and the seats made open, to settle a dispute between two farmers who had had for generations their family pews, for which they possessed an hereditary affection. It was in this case quite necessary to appropriate the seats. The congregation had not as yet been educated up to the unappropriated seat, and doubtless in this case these farmers would have left the church rather than have what they call their "rights" infringed upon.

I have said, and believe it to be true, that the best way to destroy the pew system, and to prevent appropriation of seats, is to imitate the example set us abroad in having chairs. By this means every worshipper has accommodation individually, and no room is wasted. Another difficulty often occurs due to the natural tendency of a family liking to worship together; the father, say, at one end of the seat, the children between them, and the mother at the other end. Now such a feeling must not be arbitrarily put down, as it is often conducive to great good; the parents being able to see that the children are at least decorous—if not attentive to the service. I mention these points because I think that the advocates of the Free and Open Church movement should adapt themselves to the circumstance of each individual church, rather than attempt to lay down a fixed rule which would, I think, be of too arbitrary a nature to be generally accepted. In some churches I have seen rows of chairs; but I think the system I would principally recommend is the single chair system in preference to all others, as, wherever I have seen them used, both abroad and at home, I have always noticed that where they are in use, there is really no distinction between rich and poor. The lady in satin will be found worshipping close to the poorest in the congregation. If either the one or the other does not like the vicinity of each other, all they have to do is to move their place. Besides, by the

use of chairs a great deal of space is saved, and I think it is an economical arrangement. I am quite sure that the poor prefer this system to any other, as it gives a selection of spot, and avoids any dispute as to occupying the same seat. Where open seats exist, I would suggest that it might be a good plan that those who come first to church should take the seats nearest the altar, and that each seat should be filled up before another was occupied. This would avoid very great interruption—for I know of no greater inconvenience than, after service has commenced, being interrupted by late comers, for whom, if you are on your knees, you have to rise to give them access to the seat. I have ventured to speak of the difficulties which have occurred to me in my experience, and I make these few suggestions, believing that the action of the promoters of the Free and Open Church movement will alone succeed, if they use conciliatory measures, and do not attempt to lay down a hard and fast rule. I think I have now said enough to prove that free and open churches are becoming popular, and if the people are educated up to them will become general. Doubtless, originally, there was, and is now, a certain amount of prejudice amongst the clergy themselves, and many preferred a fixed income from pew-rents rather than trust to the offertory; but to me it is most satisfactory to be able to state, not as a matter of opinion, but as a fact, and I have given you some statistics on the subject, that where the offertory is used it all but universally answers. Another prejudice, but I think that is dying out, is a sort of belief that the size of your pew and the amount you paid for it, gave you a certain amount of religious respectability. It was almost like the difference of the man who keeps a carriage and the man who does not. Another point: take domestic servants; I am very doubtful whether they like a great pew being kept for them; as a master of a large establishment I believe they infinitely prefer being allowed to worship where and how they like, and masters should give them the opportunity of going to church; and I would say, further, that it would be far better if it was not customary that they should go in a body dressed in their livery, but that time should be made for them to go, and that they ought to dress as they like, and that in God's house there should be no distinction between master and servant. I have spoken of the profitable results of the offertory as compared with the pew system, but I have not yet alluded to the Scriptural necessity for it. It is inculcated in Scripture, and we have only to read the offertory sentences in our Communion Service to convince ourselves that this is the right way to meet all necessary expenses of a church and its congregation. I now trust that I have said enough to establish two facts, viz., that pews should be done away with, and that the offertory should be always made use of. I will now say a few words, and they shall be brief, on the importance of churches being always kept open for private prayer. I could name several instances where it is of great use. To the workman and the artisan going or returning from his daily work it is a source of unspeakable comfort. To all of us, whether in joy or in sorrow, it is a great blessing either to have an opportunity of returning thanks for mercies received or to supplicate for help. Occasion is thus afforded, if one be in anger, to pray for good temper, to forget injuries; in fact, to have the advantage of the sacred building for all purposes of private prayer. There is only one argument against churches being open, that is, the

expense of having an attendant there to see that nothing is taken away, and to keep the edifice clean; but I feel sure that if an alms-box were placed at the door for those who liked to avail themselves of this privilege, these expenses would be met. As to the idea of theft and sacrilege, I think there is a remedy in the hands of the public authorities of the country. I need not say any more on this head. Not only should a church be free and open, but I would advocate continual services as long as there were people to attend to them. I believe if there was staff enough, churches would be open all day in great towns. I have no doubt that if there was a short service for a quarter of an hour every morning, before men went to work, the people would come, and be glad of it; and again in the evening. And I think this could be carried out in many cases in the agricultural districts. I go further. I say it is a disgrace to the Church of England that this is not done. Surely, with the wealth of this great country such work ought to be achieved. Putting aside the morality of the question, I would argue it on economical grounds. Look what is spent by the country annually in the repression of crime and the protection of property. Some, perhaps, will say State aid is impossible; that the Dissenters would be up and against us in a body at being made to pay for what they did not approve of. Are we sure that the Dissenters disapprove of the Established Church? I think not. Many of them attend our services, and they prefer availing themselves of the services of our Church, both for marriage and burial. I think if we could insist, at the next census, that the people should return what religious denomination they belonged to, that very large numbers would describe themselves as members of the Church of England. What I think that the Dissenters and people object to is what the promoters of the Free and Open Church state that they object to, viz:—the Church being for any particular class. It is the National Church, and the Established Church, and yet they cannot avail themselves sufficiently of her services. Therefore, some are driven to other forms of worship, and others never worship at all. Now what is our duty, and what are our objects?

1st. To maintain as a principle of the parochial system the equal right of all parishioners, rich and poor alike, to the free use of their parish church.

2d. To promote the restoration to the people of churches now closed to them by private appropriation, and the building and endowing of Free and Unappropriated Churches.

3d. To promote the revival of the weekly offertory, in substitution for pew-rents, and as the scriptural and most efficient means prescribed by the Church of England of raising money for all such pious and charitable uses as the minister and churchwardens shall think fit.

4th. To promote the opening of churches through every day in the week for private prayer.

Now I trust I have proved, both by argument and by facts, that these objects are well worthy of support. We speak with no uncertain sound—we know what our duty is. The question is, how are we to do it? I say, take the people into your confidence—take the church to them. Let services be held out of doors of the Church of England, in the great public parks. If morning and evening prayer were used in this way the

people would be attracted, and our churches would be full. Let us try in our great naval ports. Is there accommodation for the sailors and the soldiers and the poor? I say we must avail ourselves of what means we have, and when we have established the religious feeling, then we shall have our churches free and unappropriated, and this great country, famous for its wealth, its morality, and all that is worthy of her great name, will more and more stand forth in the estimation of the world as not only one of the greatest nations, but the most moral, and therefore the happiest, nation in the world.

ADDRESS.

Sir T. Percival Heywood, Bart.

It has been urged that this subject has been already too much discussed, and that it was a waste of time to adopt it as a subject for this Congress, but I think the attendance in this room proves that there is still an interest in it. For myself, I think the longer the subject is discussed, the greater the interest in it is. It is always a difficulty to a speaker not to know at all what the feelings of his audience may be. I cannot suppose for a moment that all in this room are in favour of free churches: I know that all are not in favour of appropriated ones; possibly, if the bishop were to ask for a show of hands, the preponderance might be in favour of partially apportioned seats. At all events here we are—a great assembly met for friendly discussion upon this subject. To begin with, I may tell you that I have no manner of doubt as to which is the best. The experience of long years has convinced me that there is absolutely no choice but that of perfect and entire freedom. I know that you will not all agree with me, and probably not the most persuasive eloquence that I could command would alter the opinion of one of you, but I do not doubt that you will listen to what is addressed to you by the different speakers, and moderate your views perhaps by further thought on the subject. In the matter of open churches, I conceive there can be no difference of opinion. It cannot be thought any longer that the closed church door through the week shall say the world is to be worshipped on six days, and God only on the seventh. I know no right in incumbent, churchwardens, or sexton to turn the key of the church against me; they have just as great a right to turn the key of my own private house upon me, and keep me out, as they have to keep me out of the church of God. Now let us come to the more difficult subject of appropriated and unappropriated seats. The old-fashioned high pews are not gone, but are going. Our architects will not allow in new or restored churches anything but seats of even height, and they have now almost universally refused to allow doors. I have some doubt on the subject of removing doors from appropriated seats. If a seat in a church is appropriated, I think it far better to show that there is an appropriation by putting a door. You will find in some churches "Free" painted on a seat, and those seats which have no such word upon them, you take for granted to be appropriated; but there is under any system of this sort always a difficulty in finding this out. I think those who desire to have appropriated seats, should have them distinctly marked by having doors to them; but then I should earnestly desire that every door should be very soon taken off. I am not going to argue on what there is to be said in favour of appropriated seats. I cannot see a single argument in their favour. The chief objection raised to churches with unappropriated seats, is that of overcrowding; my answer to that is that the advocates of free and open churches may then "thank God and take courage." There are remedies for all overcrowding. If two services in the day will not suffice for the worshippers, let there be three; and if three will not suffice, then let there be four. If after all there is still overcrowding, the remedy is very plain; another church is needed. I should think it no great hardship for once to be crowded out of my

church. If a rich man is crowded out of his church, let him thank God; perhaps it is a call for him to supply the spiritual wants of his neighbours; if a poor man is crowded out, let the rich man take care that as soon as possible a remedy shall be supplied. Another thing that has been said is, that in the free churches there is a difficulty in the members of different classes sitting near one another. Of that difficulty I am thankful to say I know nothing. I never felt it. I have had the privilege of worshipping for many years in an absolutely free church, and I can conscientiously say, as the churchwarden of that church, that never has the slightest difficulty occurred. I appeal boldly to many in this hall who know that church; I appeal to Lord Shrewsbury and the Dean of York who have been frequent worshippers in that church, and I am certain that neither of them can say that there has been the slightest difficulty. We adopt the practice of dividing the congregation, which I think is a most desirable one; the men being seated on one side and the women on the other. At first, of course, objections are made to this. People talk about families being divided. No one respects more than I do that desire of families to worship together; but the way I answer the objection is this—At family prayer it is not usual for the mother always to sit by the side of the father, or for the children all to sit close together. They sit in any part of the room. Then leaving the private room, which I do not think is the best place for family prayer, I hold that in the case of all large houses, there should be a prayer room, not within the doors of the house, but between the house and the premises where the out-door men are employed. Have such a room then, and conduct family prayer in it. Let all the men from the garden, the farm, and the stable, and all the women in the house come in, the men on one side and the women on the other, and then you will find that the whole objection of families being separated in church will be overcome. I am accustomed myself to have family prayer in this way, and those who have once joined in it, feel no change in going from the prayer room to the church. Then let me say that if I am to be separated in a church from my poorer neighbour in worship, I would rather keep out of that church altogether. The most lovely lessons I have ever received in public worship, I can confidently say, have been those learnt on my knees by the side of my poorest brethren. It is impossible that we can worship God aright if we feel uneasy at the near proximity of those who are in humbler life. I have been told, "Yes, you in your position may feel that, but persons in humbler positions do feel a certain amount of constraint." I answer that my experience convinces me that it is absolutely not so. And surely that proud man who thanked God that he was not like him, who, standing apart, smote upon his breast, crying "God be merciful to me a sinner," would have done better had he got into close proximity with him, and probably the next time he went into the Temple he would not have uttered such words. One of the difficulties with regard to opening all churches, is that of the pew-rents paid for the maintenance of the clergy and the service of the Church. I, of course, think that they will be overcome eventually by the offertory, which, to my mind, is not developed to anything like the extent it should be. Sometimes one hears it said, "Have you heard what a grand sum has been collected by the offertory in such and such a church in London? Do you know that £4000 or £5000 has been received in the year's offertory in such and such a church?" What does that mean? Why, every day you may read in the newspapers of a man giving more thousand pounds than that for a picture, or for a couple of vases, or for a few short-horned cows. Surely what is now given to God in God's Church is absolutely nothing compared with what it should be. It is because we have not realised all that the offertory should do that such miserably poor sums are placed there, and also because the appropriation of the money given in the offertory, has not, to my mind, been sufficiently considered. I hold that every time the offertory is collected, distinct notice should be given for what purpose it is collected. I do not like the practice of dividing the amount collected into three parts; one-third for the clergy, one-third for the poor, and one-third for the services of the Church. I think that every time you go to church you should be allowed to give as you feel disposed for one special object. It has been said that the system of having boxes at the door is not successful; I believe it is not likely to be successful until there are separate boxes, say, one for the poor, one for the

maintenance of the services of the Church, and one for the clergy. You then know distinctly what you are giving to. Then the money often remains in these boxes, and you do not know when it is transferred to the fund for which it is intended. I hold that every Sunday when the offertory is collected for the poor, or the clergy, or for the maintenance of the church, the churchwardens should empty that particular box, and present what is therein, with the offerings of the congregation, to the officiating priest. In conclusion, I would just say, that if the true principle of the offertory were thoroughly understood, the sums that we have heard of as having been contributed, would sink absolutely into insignificance.

Mr James Croston, F.S.A.

I am very glad to have the opportunity of addressing so crowded a congregation, in a building, the seats of which, if not free, are at least unappropriated. I think you have settled that point amongst yourselves, that you appear to have found no difficulty in seating yourselves here this morning. When I accepted the invitation to speak upon this subject, I confess I felt myself at the outset in a position of some difficulty, because, though I believe to a large extent in the principle of Free and Open Church Association, I think it is right to say that I have not yet been educated quite up to the standard of accepting its entire platform. Therefore, it is not unlikely that, occupying this intermediate position, in the remarks I may make I shall fail to satisfy either party, and it is just as probable that I shall succeed in giving offence to both. After the remarks that have fallen from Lord Shrewsbury and other speakers, upon what has been called the "abomination" of appropriate pews, and the evils arising from those restrictions placed upon freedom of worship, which are inseparable from the pew system, and the tendency of those restrictions to alienate the attachment of the masses of the people from their attachment to the Church, it is not necessary to dwell further upon that subject. I purpose, therefore, confining my observations to another phase of the question—how far the system and practice of letting pews is in harmony with or antagonistic to the parochial system, the retention of which, I think, we shall agree is necessary, if we are to retain the Church of England as the National Church? The parochial system in this country dates from a period long anterior to the Norman Conquest. In those early times, when a Saxon landed-proprietor founded a church, it was an evidence of his piety. He built it for the use of his family and retainers, and all who were residing on his demesne. When that became a parish church, the boundaries of the parish were identical with the boundaries of his estate, and all residing within those geographical limits had a common and equal right to the services of the minister, and of worshipping within the church during life, and to burial in its graveyard at death. And so it came to pass, that by the common law and the ancient practice of England, every parishioner acquired an equal right to a place in his parish church, which was the common heritage of the people, no distinction being made between rich and poor. They met together and worshipped as a common brotherhood before one God, the Father and Maker of them all. We sometimes hear a good deal about what was the practice of seating the people in primitive times, but I am inclined to think that if we go back to that period we shall find that the people were not seated at all; for it was not until later times, when the people had acquired more luxurious habits, that it became fashionable to introduce seats or benches into churches. At first it became the custom to indulge the patron of the church with a stall and desk within the chancel. Perhaps one of the earliest notices we have is of the date of 1240; it occurs in the injunctions of Bishop Grosthead to his diocese of Lincoln. The Dean of York has given us an example of an account paid by Sir Hugh Vaughan of 6s. 8d., as payment for his portion of a pew, but, if I mistake not, this occurs in the church accounts of St Margaret's, Westminster, under date, 1509. I am inclined to think the charge was not in the nature of a pew-rent, but was for the construction of a portion of a pew, which was not necessarily an enclosed one. It was not until after the period of the Reformation that we find the practice of charging pew-rents pre-

vailed. Gradually seats were introduced, and they were limited to the patron and persons of distinction in the parish, who erected them at their own cost in private chapels; and so long as this was the case, beyond the evil example afforded, possibly no great harm was done. But what the wealthier people did in their private chapels, others sought to do in the nave or parish portion of the church. Certain individuals had pews appropriated to them in the nave, to the exclusion of others; and when this was done, an evil was created, for this was, no doubt, an encroachment upon the common rights of parishioners. Oftentimes this was done under cover of a pretended faculty, which sought to override the law of the land, by mystifying the people as to what they might and might not do in their own parish churches. I trust I shall not be accused of want of courtesy to any member of the Episcopal bench, when I say that many of these pretended faculties by which pews held in parish churches were so appropriated, are hardly worth the paper upon which they are written. That, I think, has been fully established by Lord Tenterden, who declared that such faculties had no validity in law. A faculty cannot make that lawful which is unlawful in itself. By the common law the seats in every parish church are free and common to all the parishioners. The people have a common right in their parish church, and no power can dispossess them of it. A faculty cannot override the actual law by imposing a new one that is repugnant to the spirit and practice of it. An allusion has been made to the manner in which people began to claim the right of sittings in parish churches; but even after it became the fashion, pews or seats were only sparingly adopted, and then only for "grave and reverend signiors," and for the gentlewomen residing in the locality. Archibald Hall in his prelude to "A Series of Precedents illustrative of the Discipline of the Church of England," says that so late as 1617, it was considered an offence for a young lady to be seen seated in the same seat with her mother. The report says she was "presented, for that she being but a yonge mayde, sat in the pewe with her mother, to the great offence of many reverent women; howbeit that after I, Peter Lewis, the vicar, had in the church privatlie admonished the said yonge mayde of her fault, and advised her to sitt at her mother's pewe-doors, she obeyed; but nowe she sitts againe with her mother."

I think it is now rather the custom to put daughters in the front and mothers in the background. I have spoken so far of the practice in our more ancient parishes, but I come now to those which have been created in more recent times. In the early part of the present century, owing to the rapid increase of population in our industrial centres, there came a necessity for providing increased accommodation to meet the growing wants of the people. Under the old system before a church was consecrated and made a parish church, ample endowment had been made for the maintenance of its minister. To provide for this in the case of the modern churches, Acts of Parliament were passed, known as the Church Building Acts of William the Fourth, and it is to the evil arising from these enactments that I desire to draw your special attention. The object was to facilitate and encourage the building of churches, and as a means of providing for the maintenance of the minister, pew-rents were authorised to be charged—expediency and not principle being the distinguishing feature. I have heard this morning, on this platform, that the charging of pew-rents in these modern churches has been the salvation of the Church of England. I can accept that statement *cum grano salis*. I believe that if we are to keep the Church of England as the Church of the people, it will not be by the maintenance of money payments for the pews; but in the first instance it must be remembered these churches erected under these Church Building Acts, were not in the nature of parish churches. They were nothing more than congregational churches, or, strictly speaking, chapels of ease; and though conventional districts were assigned to them, the people retained their rights in the mother church; and so long as they remained congregational churches for conventional districts, no great harm was done. But in course of time the conventional districts, assigned to these pewed-churches, became distinct parishes; the people inhabiting them were cut off from the mother church; and under shelter of these Church Building Acts, and the pew-rents which they legalise, the people were deprived of their common right of free worship in

their parish church. Here a question arises which involves very serious considerations on the part of those who advocate the Free and Open system. In dealing with the more ancient parishes, there is little difficulty, and any churchwarden who enters upon his office with a conscientious desire to discharge the duties of such, will readily overcome any obstacles. Those who are illegally in possession of appropriated pews should be "disestablished" courteously, and with all due consideration, of course. With the modern parishes, the case is very different, for it must be confessed that there is a strong prejudice in favour of pew-rents, which appear to have the sanction of the law. It is with such parishes that I anticipate the Free and Open Church Association will experience its greatest difficulties. I was glad to hear Lord Shrewsbury advocating the policy of conciliation. I think it is desirable that in every church, claiming to be a parish church, the pews should be free and common to all the parishioners. I believe that if the Church of England is to be maintained as the National Church of this country, it will be by making her seats free and unappropriated.

The Bishop of Melbourne.

My reason for wishing to address you upon this occasion, is that a short time ago I received a request from the chairman of the Manchester Association for Freedom of Worship, to accept the office of vice-president of the association, and I prefer to give my answer publicly here (which, I hope he will kindly accept), instead of privately to himself. I think that the Church of England owes a debt of gratitude to this association, I think that it has done much good in calling attention to the abuses of the pew system, particularly to the invidious distinction made in our churches between the rich and poor. I also thoroughly approve of its advocacy of the use of the offertory in accordance with the directions of our Prayer-Book. I may, however, remind you that the offertory is a part of the communion service; and is to be used only in that service. I am not sure that the practice of making collections at every service is a wise one. I know, from my own experience in a colony, that poor persons often object to attend our churches, because they have a plate, or a bag, or whatever is used for the purpose, always held up before them. Having said thus much in commendation of the association, I will briefly state my reasons for not belonging to it. Passing by the subject of pew-rents, on which I will not now say anything, I would observe that the desire to have one's own seat at church is natural, and that it ought not to be put out of sight. In itself, the appropriation of sittings, both to the rich and poor, is not wrong, but very desirable; and the argument for free and unappropriated seats, that thereby a church which can only hold a certain number of persons, may be made to provide sittings for regular worshippers, at any particular service, beyond that number, is plainly fallacious. You cannot, as this association would persuade us, make a church hold a thousand, if it is constructed to accommodate only five hundred. My great objection, however, to the adoption of unappropriated sittings is, that it would be destructive of the parochial system. With regard to All Saints' Church, Margaret Street, to which the Dean of York alluded, I would ask whether the attendants at it are parishioners. I heard only yesterday that one of the churchwardens of a well-known church in Holborn is a non-parishioner. Regarding the parochial system as essential to the efficiency of a National Church, I would ask the members of the association to consider what they are doing, and to be content with endeavouring to effect a conservative reformation, which shall correct what is wrong, instead of introducing a radical change, which would endanger much that is right, in the arrangements of our churches.

Mr Edward Herford.

I fully accept on behalf of the National Association for Freedom of Worship, my friend, Mr Croston's "middle line," but I cannot certainly accept the views expressed by the Bishop of Melbourne. I ask you just to consider one point. The question between his lordship and myself is one of arithmetic. The model parish of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners

contains 4000 or 5000 people. If then for the sake of providing for the imaginary advantage of a family's sitting together, you divide a church holding 500 persons into 100 pews, you give to their occupants the exclusive control of those seats. His lordship is incorrect in saying that the 500 persons will come to church on his plan. The fact is, that even in the most popular preachers' districts, such as Dr McNeile's in Liverpool, and others which it would be invidious to name, in counting the congregations on Sundays, you would find that there would be 300 or 400 persons at most occupying those 500 seats. Dresses are stretched out, and hats placed on seats, so as to make the pews appear full. The principle of the pew-rent system is this—a would-be pew-holder goes to the churchwarden, not to have a place where he may go, but to secure an enclosure of his own, from which the churchwarden contracts to keep other persons out, for a payment of £5 a year. The object is really to keep other persons out. Therefore I cannot believe the bishop would reassert that he would desire this appropriation system, with or without pew-rents, carried out for the exclusive benefit of 100 families out of a thousand; because, assume that all the members will not go at once, then the non-pew-holding family arrives at a time when by the kindness of the churchwardens, the family, consisting of father and mother, and a few children, may be shown into church. They go one *here* and another *there*, in the spaces left in different pews. Whereas on the free system the father and the elder boy will sit together, and the mother and a dozen girls, if there happen to be so many, may also sit together. I have an arithmetical scale showing that in the most crowded church, as St Martin's, Scarborough, a family of sixteen may sit together, if they go one quarter of an hour before service time; that eight may sit together if they go ten minutes before, and so on. Of course there is not time to put the whole argument before you; but I speak from experience, and from the details which come before us in connection with this movement. As to the law, I do not think there is the slightest doubt (and I speak as a lawyer), that no custom can be valid which did not have its beginning at or before the time of the return of Richard I. from the Crusades. The closing of the church against the parishioners on week days, or the closing of a great portion of the church, is a practice of much more recent date, and therefore not legal; but, just as the animals of which we have just been told, being vivisected cannot speak, to tell us of their wrongs, so the mass of the people have become dead to a sense of their rights and duties; therefore they do not care for this exclusion from which the nation and the National Church receive so much harm.

The Rev. Dr E. H. Perowne.

I ENTIRELY agree with every word which fell from the Lord Bishop of Melbourne; but I hope I may be permitted, while supporting his lordship's view of the subject, to lay before this Congress some additional reasons for a modified appropriation of seats in our parish churches. We have been reminded that the Church of England is not only a National Church, but that as such she is supposed to cover the whole country with a network of parishes she claims as her own. She is entrusted by the nation with the spiritual charge of the whole population of England and Wales. Hence it is that our Church system is of necessity a parochial system, of which, as it seems to me, the most precious characteristic is this, that it enables the clergy, and requires the clergy to stand in a pastoral relation to people, men, women, and children, entrusted to their care. The great glory of our Church system, the great source of its usefulness, the great reason why it ought to be maintained, is that it is essentially *pastoral*. Now, I think that there is a great danger of weakening this pastoral relation which ought to subsist between a parochial clergyman and his flock, by the introduction everywhere of what are called Free and Open Churches, *i.e.*, of a system by which each parishioner may occupy in the course of the year as many different places as there are sittings in the Church. If the whole congregation is thus in a state of continual flux, how can the pastor's eye rest with satisfaction on the regular attendant, and note the occasional or frequent absentee? And yet, it is thus that on the one hand the

earnest pastor's heart is cheered, and on the other he is led to the house of the absent member of his congregation, to give a word of warning or comfort, as the case may require. I may assume that all in this hall agree with me that the great object for which we assemble in church, is that we may all worship Almighty God devoutly, in spirit and truth. I venture to think that an *assured place* in the church does conduce to this end. It has been said by preceding speakers that parishioners have a common law right to accommodation in the parish church. Why should not the regular church-goer have the same seat every Sunday; the same seat so long as he goes in good time; the same seat even when a popular preacher is announced to occupy the pulpit? We are all the creatures of habit. We are likely to worship with less distraction in our appropriated seats, than if after a struggle, after (it may be) a separation of the several members of a family, we at length find ourselves in a fresh seat every Sunday. I appeal to you, as persons of experience. Is not the spot in God's house, in which you have, it may be, first been led to think and feel deeply on religious subjects, a sacred spot? Is not the place where you have consciously received the blessing for which you prayed, hallowed ground? You know it is. You say "It is good for us to be here. I would fain go there again and yet again. I desire to go quietly and regularly, and I hope I may experience continued and increased blessing by regular attendance in God's house of prayer." Such a feeling is right and ought to be encouraged in the interests of spiritual religion, no less than of the pastoral system of our National Church. In the phrase of the day, we ought "to put a premium" on *regular attendance* at church. And yet, I think, nothing has a greater tendency to discourage it than the universal adoption of what is called the Free and Open Church system. While I gratefully acknowledge the good done by the Society by the abolition of the pew system, while I would make all seats free when service is once commenced, and would take away periodically, even from parishioners, their appropriated seats, which they only occasionally occupied, I would not force all churches and parishes into a Procrustean bed, or spur the hobby which some of my friends seem disposed to ride so hard as to imperil the safety of those whose interests they have at heart, as much as I have myself. I have lately been told by one whose earnestness in the cause of Free and Open Churches I greatly admire, that I must either join his Society or set myself in opposition to St Paul and St James. Now I am not going to be impaled on either horn of this dilemma. As regards the weekly offertory, St Paul's words (1 Cor. xvi. 2) are not the expression of a universal rule, but a particular injunction to an individual church under special circumstances. And they bid the Corinthians *not* to put a sum every week into the plate or bag, but to lay up at home a portion of that increase which God may have given them. The other passage in St James' Epistle, so far from condemning the appropriation of seats in the church, seems (James ii. 5, 6) rather to favour it. But it does condemn *mis*appropriation. It does forbid us to give all the best seats to the rich. It does not discourage such an appropriation as is a help to regular attendance and, as I think, an aid to undistracted and devout participation in the service of the sanctuary.

Earl Nelson.

I WISH to say a few words for the purpose of making it quite clear that this question is in no sense a party one, political or religious, although a very great principle does lie at the root of it, the principle of selfishness or unselfishness; all the ways by which we may meet people half-way without destroying our real principles, are to be tested by the question—Is the thing that we want to do a "selfish or an unselfish thing?" We have heard from the last speaker a plea made for the pastoral work of the Church, and for the importance of a clergyman seeing the well-known faces of his flock about him; but I believe that whatever the pew system may do for the pastoral work of the Church, it utterly ignores the missionary work of the Church. In the first ages of Christianity in this country, our churches were free, and the effect of that was, that the heathen, one by one, crept in and heard the truth;

the heathen of our large towns at the present time would do the same, but they are kept out of our churches, and therefore are prevented from hearing the truths of Christianity. The importance of this principle is witnessed to by the Bishop of London's Fund; as soon as they start a district, they have a mission-chapel, but they never dream of having appropriated seats there; and when a mission is held in a pewed church, I am happy to say, that the pew-holders willingly and nobly give up their seats for the mission week. This being so, I ask why do these same people, as soon as they have built a church in the mission district, set up pew rents; and why, when the mission week is over, are the parish churches shut against those who have, during the mission week, been brought to Christ? Surely if it is so necessary that the confirmed church-goer should have the luxury of sitting in the same seat where he was first moved by a sermon or a reading of God's Word, how much more important is it that the recent convert should have a chance of attending again in some corner of the church in which, but a few days back, he had heard the glad tidings with joy.

Sir Antonio Brady.

I wish to protest in the strongest terms against certain proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which I would endeavour, in the few minutes at my disposal, shortly to explain to this meeting. I live in a poor and crowded district amidst mission work in the extreme east of London, where Free and Open Churches are a necessity if the poor are to be reached by ministerial agency; and my object in rising to speak on the present occasion is to protest in the name of all that is good and holy, against the means stated to be taken in some instances by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to perpetuate those abominations called pew-rents, and which in most districts exclude the poorer classes from our national churches. It appears from an article in the "Free and Open Church Advocate," which I hold in my hand, that the Commissioners inherited a small balance from the million and a half of money voted by Parliament in 1818 and 1824 for building churches. Finding that if this money came to an end, the pew-imposing clauses of the old Church Building Acts would also cease, the Commissioners hit upon a highly ingenious plan to prolong those clauses. They repeated the story of the widow's cruse, but without the miracle. They invented a system of "nominal grants" to Church-Building Funds—that is to say, grants of £10 or £5, or it might be 5s.—which were made on the understanding that they must not be asked for, and that they would not be paid. By this plan the fund would never be exhausted, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have thus, as the successors of the old Church Building Commission, qualified themselves to impose legal scales of pew-rents It really seems to me that, if this is the true state of affairs, the Church Building Acts ought long ago to have ceased, and that scales of pew-rents ought no longer to be imposed in new churches. The Free and Open Church Association has done well in drawing attention to the subject, which is evidently not generally understood. I hope that the matter will not be allowed to drop until an end has been put to what I could not, with every feeling of respect for the eminent persons forming the Commission, refrain from characterising as a "pious fraud."

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, 6th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took the Chair at Half-Past Two o'Clock.

MISSIONS AND MISSIONARY BISHOPRICS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. T. Valpy French, M.A., Rector of St Ebbe's, Oxford.

It would be difficult to sum up in few words the great blessings and successes which have resulted from the establishment, during the last four years, of new missionary bishoprics. We might dwell on the animating and invigorating influence they have had on the missionary clergy; the bringing to a head, and furnishing rallying points for many scattered, indecisive, if not aimless efforts; the more steady, consecutive adherence secured to fixed principles of action; the greater confidence of native congregations in the durability and settled character of our Christian institutions,—the larger number (in South Africa especially) of native chieftains and heads of influence, who are coming forward to be "nursing fathers and mothers of the Church;" the greater improbability of vacancies in mission fields caused by sickness, deaths, or removals, being left long and disastrously unfilled; the greater realisation by native Christians after confirmation, of their call to be Christian soldiers, office-bearers, and trust-holders in Christ's Church. Manifestly, too, the increase of native clergy, the careful husbanding and economising of forces, the discovery of latent gifts, the summoning into exercise of dormant and buried energies, the greater wisdom and far-sightedness of plans, the increased unity and promptness of execution, the impetus and energy thrown (where the right man is in the right place) into all departments of labour, so that when the guiding hand which gave the springs of the machinery their first impulse, is in God's providence withdrawn, all is not brought to a stand-still, as was notably the case in Melanesia, of which it was lately said by one writing from the spot:—"One of the most encouraging proofs of the soundness of principle on which this mission has been established, the high motives which animated its missionaries, and the reality of the work which it has been privileged to accomplish, is to be found in the position which the mission now occupies, the godly concord of the several members, and the zeal with which its objects have been carried out since the bishop's death. Had personal feeling rather than principle animated the missionaries, its present position would surely have been less satisfactory."

Of a like character is the testimony borne some years ago to the growth of the Borneo Mission:—"The peaceful, steady expansion of the native Church in Borneo continues to supply an argument in favour of placing missions at a very early stage under the charge of a resident bishop."

We might add also, that which fresh proof continually verifies, that the

missionary bishop's call for men and means at home, seldom fails of a heartier and more liberal response than that of less officially responsible labourers. Nor need we dwell on the deeply valuable blessings which a true missionary bishop's visits to the flocks and shepherds under his charge full often leave behind them; not merely in the memory of his teaching and suggestions, and in the "setting in order of the things that are wanting;" but in the holy impress left by the spirituality of his character, the loving, sympathetic, fervent tone of his private converse and public ministrations. No one can read the report of either society without being struck with the frequent recurrence of such unburdening of thankful, (perhaps once desolate) hearts after the visit of such a true father in God and brother in Christ.

This rough summary is sufficient of itself to show what a rare combination of gifts is needed for the exercise of this holy office; not to mention preaching powers, powers of acquiring languages, of training successors (of which more anon), not to speak of the rich grace and force of character men need, to be the foremost of pioneers in labour and peril, "*in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ*," to bear about "*the dying of the Lord Jesus;*" that genuine martyr spirit, which being not talked about, but actually exhibited, proves the consecration to the work, and of which the result is that a man is followed with confidence, and not servilely, but reverently and lovingly obeyed. Such was (after the Lord and His apostles) Barnabas as described in the Acts, Titus, in Second Epistle to Corinthians, or Timothy in the Epistle to the Philippians. And we believe that the great "Shepherd and Bishop of souls," who has not failed us before, will not be wanting to us now. We have the rich pledge and promise of this in some honoured names of this century within our Church and outside of it: especially Mackenzie, Pattison, Stirling, Vidal, Callaway, Noble, and not a few living men, whom it would be invidious to name, called to be bishops or doing much of the work of bishops, to whom, as to Titus, the apostle's grand panegyric pre-eminently belongs, "*the messengers of the churches and the glory of Christ.*"

Time would fail us to sketch, ever so rapidly, the lessons with which the history of early missionary bishops furnishes us, such as St Patrick, Frumentius in Abyssinia, Ulphilas journeying with the Goths, and translating the word of God for them; St Chrysostom perhaps exchanging (during his martyr-like wanderings) the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, for camp ministrations to the roving Goths; St Columba training up his little school of missionary bishops, among them St Aidan, a very model of the character we describe to-day, whom I have led my students at Lahore to look upon as well worthy of their respect and imitation, as St Bede describes him in his too brief, but clearly historical record, a truly British, not Romish predecessor of the saintly Pattison, whether we refer to his abundant prayers; his deep, patient, experimental research of the Holy Scriptures; his labours among princes and peasants, young and old; his meek lowliness yet bold faithfulness; his endurance of hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ; his initiation both "*to be full and to be hungry;*" his itinerating labours and preachings with his disciples; his steady persistence in the work to which the Lord called him; his fast standing and straight walking in the old paths; at the same time, his regular adherence to Church solemnities and stated offices; his careful-

ness to train a band of successors. Have we not here painted for us, as by the Lord's own hand, the spirit and walk which the missionary bishop should be of?

We shall feel, I think, that the trainer of missionary bishops must be of a kind of prophetical and angelical type. Such St Columba, the trainer of St Aidan, was believed to be by the saintliest of his own and after ages. Probably the Syrian Church in its brightest and purest days, when it had the open door given it into India and China, and it arose and shone, had men of this extraordinary mark and stamp, in its colleges of Edessa and Nisibis. And then we come to the days when great Christian princes like Pepin, Lewis the Pious, and Charlemagne, partly it must be owned, with the view of tightening their grasp on conquered but restless provinces, and partly under the solemn constraint of deeper and higher responsibilities, sought to extend the kingdom and Church of Christ by calling to the forefront men of piety, learning, devotedness, and force of character, and setting them down in the midst of vast tracts of heathendom, to reclaim them from savagery and superstition to the light and liberty of God's holy truth. Patriarchs in the East, such as Timotheus of blessed memory, almost contemporary with Boniface and his followers in the West, were training and sending Nestorian bishops eastward (Neander v. 115) even to India and China, probably with the concurrence of their synods and collegiate staffs, and Coptic patriarchs from the time of the Emperor Justinian consecrated missionary bishops for Abyssinia and Nubia. And Church history tells us how they were often seconded in these efforts by zealous popes and patriarchs, such as Anschar in Hamburgh, Boniface and others in Maintz and Cologne; our own English bishops, too, occasionally designating and ordaining men for foreign work. (The fragmentary notices scattered through early Church histories make it often difficult to determine what compromise of authority was arrived at between prelates, kings, and synods, in appointing and sending forth missionary bishops.) These bishops had not always strictly defined spheres and centres of action; but under the name of "episcopi regionarii" were allowed to select for themselves independent scenes of labour (Neander v. 50). Early in the seventh century we find a Frankish synod entrusting St Columban's successor with a mission in South Germany, which, of his own free will and judgment, he extended as far as Bavaria. In St Boniface's age synodical authority in these matters grew to be more distinctly recognised. The missionary bishop usually had his training college then called monastery, containing one or two choice disciples, it would seem, on whom he would expend many years of toilsome, but affectionate and confidential labour, making them partakers of his thoughts, knowledge, experiences, toils, and perils, that, "*as sons with fathers,*" they might "*serve with them in the gospel.*" The Christ that lived in themselves they laboured by pains and prayer to reproduce in their spiritual children. To them they looked and not in vain for worthy successors. But time will not retrace its footsteps; regrets, if indeed we have them, will not bring back those despotic monarchs, those territorially mighty prelates, scarcely those great missionary training schools, with Bedes and Alcuins, some of the world's master spirits, counsellors of kings (sometimes holy and humble men of heart withal), at their head. But happily these things in the shape they then took, were the *accidents* of the great work, rather than of its *substance* and essence. The substance

lies here, "*The Lord gave the word, great was the company of the preachers,*" the preaching churches, so some would expound the feminine gender here. And if the churches of Christ as a whole, instead of individuals, addict themselves to this ministry, with its burdens and its privileges; then, provided they do not enfeeble and cripple the hands of the officers of their choice, by captious fault-findings, suspicions, and jealousies, the work done and successes achieved may in the end be deeper grounded, and, if not holier, yet more fruitful, more strictly apostolic, scriptural and abiding; even though in our patient search for the right methods of action we may have to fight our way through the wrecks of some too precipitate experiments. At any rate, if the *substantial* part be given by the Lord Himself in the larger outpouring of His Spirit, and in the deepening recognition that it is a great work we have in hand, and that *it is the Church's work*, then it will be nothing to the Lord to provide us with what are the *accidents* of the work. Kings and ministers cannot be, if they would, nursing fathers in the sense in which they once were. The Marquis of Salisbury and Lord Caernarvon say in effect, "Don't look to us, act for yourselves." It was in another sense, *i.e.*, efforts for obstruction and eradication of the slave trade, that Dr Livingstone wrote: "Palmerston and Clarendon are missionaries of the first water." Western patriarchs will not spring up to meet the exigencies of, what we may call, this great missionary crisis, although the missionary bishoprics framed and provided for during the last generation, bear witness to the growing measure of attention bestowed on the subject by our southern archbishops and Bishops of London. I must add the zealous efforts made in its behalf by the late Bishop of Winchester, and the metropolitans of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, in conjunction with the committees of our great societies: and meantime missionary bishoprics are nobly pressed forward to, and filled to God's glory, by men of good family, good means, and high university distinction, from the bishop's son and the senior wrangler downwards. These signs are surely hopeful earnests; and this we see too, that the missionary bishop follows more often the ancient primitive model of establishing colleges for the training of native clergy, and among them men (we may well believe) on whom his bishop's staff and seal, and still better his spiritual mantle will descend. So it is in Zululand, and Bloemfontaine, where a theological college has just been established to the great joy of its bishop, who remarks in a late report, "The very presence of such an institution in our midst, and the knowledge of its existence and object, would suggest and draw out a devotion of that life to the service of our Lord in His ministry, which would otherwise either not be realised or soon stifled. There is nothing in the whole machinery of missionary agency, which can be of such importance for present development and future stability and growth of Christ's Church." We cannot doubt what the Bishop of Grahamstown thinks of such institutions, when we find him, during a part of the year, taking a direct personal part in the institution of a class of students. The new missionary bishop of N. China seems strongly possessed with the same idea. In his first charge he maintains, in vigorous and trenchant language, the pre-eminence of the missionary element as the substance of his bishopric, and marks out the missionary college as one of the first and choicest objects of his labours, and that to which he looks as the most fruitful feeder of his diocesan effort. Here at least our

old and our new missions are at one. Let us trust then that the missionary bishop, and the missionary training college, will come to be almost inseparably associated in idea, and blent in practice. There are few things which the study of our ancient Church missions impresses on us more vividly, prominently, and incessantly, than this. After the example, too, of the same primitive models, the students from those institutions will come to have the sound healthiness and reality of their work tested, not so much by the number of books distributed, sermons preached, towns and villages visited, but in the number of scattered sheep gathered, and churches formed, though those churches be ever so small, so that everywhere the preacher's work, having seed in itself, may be left germinating and growing. And then for the founding and initiating of those churches, in the gathering of which he has "*purchased to himself a good degree, and much boldness in the faith of Christ*," his ordination will naturally in due time follow; and as these churches grow and multiply, for the further ordering, organising, and confirming of those churches, he will, as in early days, have the name and office assigned him of bishop of the central and main church, with superintendence of the rest; thus being in the truest and highest sense the missionary bishop, if the missionary in him keep pace with the bishop. Such is the kind of programme of their work which I have put before my little students' band at Lahore; because we must all, the more we think about it, desire that the present English missionary bishop period be provisional and temporary only, shortly (how shortly who can say?) to be followed by the native missionary bishop period. In any case it seems important, that wherever a large circle of Christian churches is being formed as (*e.g.*) in Ranchi and its neighbourhood among its many thousands of Christian Coles, in the Teloogoo country among the Tamils, where a harvest of many rich shocks is being gathered; in the fresh accessions of Christian flocks which the Lord is almost daily giving to His Church in the Lo Nguong districts of China; in the Ceylon native Christian churches, of which the last four years have witnessed a most cheering and gladdening growth, not of numbers alone, but of the spiritual power, the shining light, and the far-echoing voice; that in all such cases, bishops should with as little delay as possible be set in charge, and the men whom God has specially blest in the initiation and enlargement of those missions, would (ordinarily though not exclusively) be charged with the episcopal guardianship of them. Our two great missionary societies, whom I have been used to liken to two missionary orders in our Church, (and which, therefore, I neither desire nor expect to see either swallowing up one the other, or amalgamated the one with the other) have with increasing unity of action in this matter kept in view the formation of missionary bishoprics. The question, on which there is to some extent divergence of opinion, is one of which the early Church had no uniform and conclusive solution. I mean whether our missions should start from the very outset with a completely organised Church system, possessing the Church orders in full development, or whether the Episcopate should grow out of the increased exigencies of an already fruit-bearing mission. In Borneo, Madagascar, Zululand, Melanesia, for instance, we have missionary bishoprics established almost from the very first. In China, New Zealand, and our North American dioceses, the reverse principle has been acted on in the main. The case of South India,

with its ninety native mission clergy, is quite unique, and will be handled by my brethren who follow. No reflecting mind will believe what some have told us, that India, the land of old refinement and classic, philosophic, mental culture, cannot produce, at present, what the negro African race has produced, a valuable and model missionary bishop. If its native Church is not yet equal to this, it would be a serious and dark blot upon us, as a missionary band, and with which I for one could never consent to stigmatise a body of men of which were Schwartz, Thomas, Brotherton, and Ragland. We can do a great deal at the point we have now reached (if not before), in bringing the Christian natives of India vividly to realise the idea, and to feel the incalculable importance of a national Church, well-rooted in the soil, growing out of its place, and sinking deep into the hearts, lives, daily practices, struggles, and hopes of the people; having entrusted to it the power to originate and initiate further movement, and, having received its orders from an ancient Apostolic Church, to be recruited and perpetuated henceforth from itself (by the good pleasure and continued help of the "Shepherd and Bishop of souls"), in more and more vigorous branchings forth to yet unevangelised peoples. This we can do, and while their churches are poor, we can, it seems to me, do them no harm but rather good by helping them in the establishment of native clergy-training colleges, native pastoral funds, and native Episcopate funds. This we have long felt to be both a more serviceable and more economical expenditure of our funds, than small payments doled out from home to catechists, who have been often placed in the pitifully servile position of the missionary's clients and dependents, and would, many of them, have been far more useful as hard-working government servants than receiving their month's pittance and programme of labour from the missionary. China and Ceylon (as well as India, of which I can personally bear witness) appear to have in their present native teachers the embryo of very valuable and influential missionary bishops, in men who approve themselves as ministers of Christ, by many of those characteristic signs which in St Paul's eyes were the seal and stamp of apostleship. Writing in 1869 from Columbo, Bishop Claughton writes:—"One of the most important features in the missionary work of the S. P. G. in this diocese is the increased number of ordained natives, and the effect of the change has been highly satisfactory. I have frequently borne testimony to the fidelity of the native clergy; and I can only repeat, what I have often asserted, that I have almost universally had cause for thankfulness that I had ventured to follow almost literally the charge to "*ordain elders in every city*," in the placing over the missions, subject to my own oversight (as a rule), those that were *of themselves*. In several districts they have native priests and deacons of their own race working under them, *and in almost every case the result has been both to increase the numbers, and improve the character, of the native converts*" (S. P. G. Report, 1869).

And I feel sure that the Bishop of Madras would, out of his unselfish, loving spirit, re-echo but too gladly the words of the lamented Bishop Cotton, when he expressed his firm conviction that "if the English were expelled to-morrow, Christianity would still hold its own in the native Church of Tinnevelly," and his earnest hope that (as he puts it) "we English bishops are only the foreign Augustines and Theodores, to be followed, we trust, by a goodly succession of native Stigands and Langtons."

We shall most of us be agreed, I think, in rejoicing that, if we may judge by the evident signs there are of the native Church setting out on the hitherto untrodden pathway of energetic, self-sprung, missionary action, we may hope soon to see the day when the missionary episcopate will be established in the very midst of the people, on as strong and broad a basis as in St Cyprian's day, when the concurrence of the different orders of the clergy of the district assembled in synod, with that of the body of the Christian laity (and in after-times of the Christian ruler), were regarded as giving validity and unquestioned recognition to the authority of the bishop so appointed.*

In our present Church councils, local and now even provincial, we have (please God) the germ of future synods. With elections placed on such a broad basis, it would sometimes, not often, happen that a European would be chosen, in preference to a native brother, to fill the office ; no matter this, because such an one would have come first to be of themselves, "*in their hearts to live and to die with them.*" In the Punjab I think I know whom, almost to a man, the native Christian churches would select.

As to ourselves (brethren and fathers), I believe that as there grows upon us a deepening sense of the need of organising, establishing, and further expanding the work which God of His great love and power has given into our hands to do, men of that stamp of character which the missionary bishopric demands, will be raised up in increasing numbers.

I have sometimes thought that our great societies may see their way to accept, in process of time, not single candidates for the missionary office alone, but small bodies of candidates, bound to one another by some principles of subordination, recognising, at the same time, on all important questions, the direction of the society with which they were associated at the first, by oneness of judgment and principle, and by, at least, partial provision of the needful funds ; such a band as Bishop Armstrong spoke of in the last letter received by his society before his death. "I wish that, in God's name, some twenty of our brethren would offer themselves, and come out together, and take spiritual possession of this country ; that they might, with many voices, preach the saving doctrine of the cross. I long (he says) for a great work. It is no less than a *company* of faithful men, warmed with a holy love for souls, that I do so ardently desire." Noble words truly, and worthy of being engraven, inured in every Christian heart. Mr Brotherton speaks, on one occasion, of his district being large enough to employ a college of missionaries. I have asked myself, "Might it not be brought into harmony with the working of our mission bodies, that such a band of comrades should be encouraged to occupy, for Christ and His Church, a district where little or no work of evangelising had been attempted, or where it had met with seeming failure? with the idea, perhaps, that ultimately the man marked out by the Holy Spirit's power, and the willing suffrages of his brethren, would naturally come to be entrusted with a kind of suffragan episcopate (in the later sense of the term), would become, in fact, the *episcopus regionarius* already referred to, and would take that lead for which, by abundance of labour, force, and commanding influence of character, and by the Lord's

* Cypr. Ep. 52. Cornelius factus est episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de clericorum pæne omnium testi monio, de plebis quæ tunc affuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum anti : quorum et bonorum virorum collegio cum nemo ante se factus esset.

own testimony to the word of His grace through his lips, more than by precedence of office, he seemed manifestly designed." I cannot say whether such an idea can be worked out in practice to any great extent, so as that, without any approach to the monastic spirit and rules, we might see restored the healthy co-operation, and willing mutual subordination of bands of missionary associates and comrades, colleges of missionaries, in fact, which might do, if ever so little, to wipe off the stigma which has come in some minds to be attached to our methods of missionary working, that too much is sacrificed to individuality and independence of action ; and that it would be wholesome for us to resort to some more uniform and systematic method—to consent to bind ourselves by stricter bonds of order and obedience. It is possible, at least, that the adoption of the *primus-inter-pares* principle might lead to a still more harmonious, more vigorously aggressive, and steadily consolidated course of action. Mrs Raikes' article in the *Mission Field*, August 1875, is worthy of study in connection with this subject.

We may say that almost the first half of this century was spent in struggling with the infant difficulties of the work of reclaiming for Christ and His Church, the "*much land remaining to be possessed.*" The next quarter of it we have been slowly yet steadily feeling our way towards reducing to order and system, and further expanding the results of our predecessors' labours.

We now enter on another, the last quarter. God grant (I believe He will grant) that in it both the deep rooting of the work in Christ the Rock—which is the grand point of all—and the well-ordering and edifying of it in love, through the greater completeness of those divers orders and ministrations He appointed for His Church, will increase in accelerated ratio to the glory of our gracious Lord, and the lowlier homage and more joyous thanksgivings of the hosts of His redeemed.

The Rev. David Fenn, M.A.

The words "Mission" and "Missionary" have of late years been used in various significations. In this afternoon's subject, as the President has explained, it is intended to limit their meaning to missions to non-christian nations. Therefore, not only are all home missions excluded from our present consideration, but also missions to our fellow-countrymen, in the colonies and in foreign lands. In this restricted but original sense of the word, the experience of our Church in missions hardly extends beyond sixty years. It is true that one of our two missionary societies is now in its 174th year. But if I read its published statements aright, its annual income for the first 110 years—*i.e.*, from 1701 to 1811—hardly ever reached £5000and whatever it may have been, it was mainly expended on work among our fellow countrymen abroad. By the year 1820, missionary zeal in our Church, as shown by pecuniary contributions, had considerably increased, £11,000 being that year's contribution to the S. P. G. and £30,000 to the C. M. S. During the fifty-five years that have since passed, the income of the societies has gone on increasing, and amounted last year to £135,000 and £173,000 respectively. Of these sums, after deducting the expenditure on necessary home expenses, and on work

among our countrymen abroad, the totals spent in missions to the heathen for the year 1874 amounted, as far as I can calculate, to £45,000 by the S. P. G. and £145,000 by the C. M. S.

Our present position, as a missionary Church, is therefore one which we have very recently occupied, and it is not a matter of surprise, if advanced progress can be shown in but one or two mission fields. To-day's subject, "Missions and Missionary Bishops," to my mind implies advanced progress; for I hold that the highest function of a missionary bishop, is that of fostering, and organising, and training for independence a native mission Church which has been gathered out of heathenism by missionary presbyters, or by missionary laymen. None of the existing missionary sees of our Church have been altogether of this kind, though some approximate to it. There are, for instance, some in which after the mission has been a longer or shorter time in existence, and a few congregations of converts have been gathered into the fold, a bishop has been appointed, generally one of the leading presbyters in the field, rather with the view of giving more compactness to the present evangelistic work, and a right direction in the future to the infant Church, than because the immediate exigencies of the mission imperatively demanded the presence of a bishop. Such are the bishoprics of the Niger, of North China, of Madagascar, and of those two recently partitioned off from the diocese of Rupert's Land, Moosonee and Athabasca. In other missionary sees the rapidly increasing English population will probably at no distant date absorb the native Church, for whose benefit the bishopric appears in the first instance to have been founded. Such are the dioceses of Waiapou and Wellington in New Zealand, and of Rupert's Land and its daughter Saskatchewan in N.W. America.

In none of these cases can it be said, that the missionary bishop's energies are concentrated on the work of fostering and organising the native Church. A considerable portion of his time must be either occupied with the work of an ordinary missionary, or with the oversight of our own fellow-countrymen. Even the diocese of Sierra Leone does not exactly come up to my ideal of a missionary diocese, since it is an English colony, and its inhabitants, gathered from 100 different tribes in the interior, and using English as their language, can hardly be regarded as having a nationality of their own.

There remains but one portion of the whole field of missions, occupied by our Church, in which the number of converts within a manageable area is such as to render a missionary bishopric, of the class I refer to, a possibility. That district is Tinnevelly—it occupies a position quite unique; for I believe that there is not in the whole field of modern Protestant missions any district (with the single exception of that containing the congregations connected with the London Missionary Society in and around the capital of Madagascar) that contains within a similar area so large a number of baptized converts, of catechumens, of communicants, and of native ordained ministers, as are to be found in connection with the two Church of England Missionary Societies in Tinnevelly. The Tamil-speaking country, of which Tinnevelly is the southernmost portion, is itself the most favoured in regard to Christian progress of all the language divisions of India. Extending from Madras to Cape Comorin, it covers an area about equal to that of England and Wales; and though it contains but one-

seventeenth part of the population of India, there are as many native Protestant Christians to be found among the Tamils as there are in all the rest of India. Tinnevelly, the most Christianised of the nine Tamil districts, is about equal in size to the county of Yorkshire with the addition of Westmoreland. Out of its population of a million and a half, it contains 60,000 persons connected with our Church of England Missions, two-thirds of whom are baptized Christians, the remainder catechumens. The Tinnevelly Mission was commenced about one hundred years ago. by German Lutheran missionaries, who were maintained by our own Christian Knowledge Society. It is thus much older than other missions in India, where numbers have of late years flocked into the Church, as that to the Coles in Chota Nagpore, and that to the Telugus in Nellore, Cuddapah, and the Kistna district. All these were twenty-five years ago with hardly an exception heathen. Tinnevelly had even then 35,000 Christians and catechumens.

Looking then at its numbers alone, Tinnevelly may seem to have been ripe for a bishop of its own for many years past; and its erection into a see has again and again been proposed during the twenty-three years that I have had the happiness of being a missionary in South India. Among other plans it was suggested ten or twelve years ago that a native clergyman should be raised to the episcopate. It was held, however, by the majority of those best acquainted with the circumstances of the mission that such a step would have been premature. The motto "make haste slowly," it was felt safest to be followed. A certain amount of intelligence and independence of thought on the part of the laity in the Church must accompany the independence of its clergy. Now the great bulk of the 60,000, that have come over to Christianity in Tinnevelly, as of the 164,000 in the west of India, are drawn from classes that are probably even less intelligent than the uneducated portion of the agricultural classes in England. Add to this that when converts join us, as in Tinnevelly, in families and in groups of families mostly of the same class and caste, there must needs be an admixture of many imperfect members, of many hollow professors; and even in the case of those who are sincere, inferior and worldly motives often mingle with the conviction that Christianity is the true religion, and Christ the only Saviour. Surrounded too as they are by heathen relatives and heathen superiors, and possessed themselves of but little education, and enjoying but few of the religious advantages which we enjoy in Christian lands, it is no wonder if their faith is feeble and their progress slow. It is not surprising, then, if those who know their infirmities are loth to leave them to themselves, or entrust them altogether to the care of teachers drawn from themselves.

Of late years, however, considerable advance has been made. The Sharnars, who, though not the most numerous class in Tinnevelly, have been the most ready to embrace Christianity, are as a body rising in wealth and intelligence. In the Church councils, which have been recently established with the view of calling forth the consultative powers of native laymen as well as native clergy, and thus giving them a voice in Church matters, their head men display a fair amount of common sense. Add to this that there is among the converts in Tinnevelly a larger proportion than in other rural missions in South India of persons of higher caste and higher mental power. Many of the Christians have also come in for a share of that

western education now so rapidly spreading over India, and some of them have even matriculated at the Madras University, while a few have been appointed by Government to posts of influence in the magisterial and revenue departments. The native ministers and the unordained teachers are as a rule consistent and earnest Christians. In many cases they are looked up to with sincere respect by influential heathen in their neighbourhood as well as by their native flocks.

The time seemed, therefore, to have come for making a forward movement toward the independence of the native Church, and with this view the question of a bishop or bishops for Tinnevelly has again been mooted. Not that episcopal superintendence has been lacking to our fellow Christians there. The Bishops of Madras have always taken the liveliest interest in that mission; triennial visitations have been paid by them with the utmost regularity. Thousands of natives have they confirmed, and no fewer than sixty clergymen, ordained by them, are at this time labouring in Tinnevelly, besides others who have been taken to their rest.

It is rather because of the advance which the native Church has made in intelligence, in independence, and in the important matter of pecuniary contributions to the support of its ministers, that the Bishop of Madras and the committees both of the Propagation and of the Church Missionary Societies, with the cordial concurrence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, have thought that the time has now come for some modification of the existing system.

The step which has been proposed, and which, after nearly three years' discussion, is now, I believe, about to be carried out, is the consecration by the metropolitan of India, of the senior missionary of each of the two societies in Tinnevelly, as suffragans to the Bishop of Madras. They will naturally as bishops be able to exercise a more powerful influence over the numerous native presbyters, than if they continued presbyters themselves; they will have opportunities which the Bishop of Madras cannot have of judging of the fitness of those who will now, in increasing numbers, be added to the ranks of the native ministry. They will also be in a better position to foster and encourage native Church councils, and thus call forth more and more a public opinion in matters connected with the well-being of the Church, as well as promote healthy co-operation between native clergy and native laity.

The circumstance that these two bishops will still be connected with the two Missionary Societies involves no novelty; for already, eleven of our colonial and missionary bishops are on the list of the missionaries either of the C.M.S. or of the S.P.G. To my own mind it is an additional recommendation of the plan. To sever too suddenly the links between the native Church and the English Societies, might prove disastrous. Had time permitted, I should have endeavoured to show how that connection, and the counsel received from time to time by working missionaries, and native clergy, and laity from the committees of the two societies, has tended to the healthy development of the work, and has especially promoted the independence of the native Church. The growth of the independence of a feeble native Church, such as that of Tinnevelly, should answer to the description which Tennyson gives of the English constitution—

> "Where freedom broadens slowly down from precedent to precedent."

But while too sudden a change is thus avoided, I believe that the appointment of English suffragan bishops will effectually pave the way for the division of Tinnevelly, at no distant date, into sees for native bishops, who will mutually support one another, and be aided by synods of native clergy and laity, and sustained by the revenues of the native Church. When the ἐνθαυχσία of the mission shall thus have been attained, then may this, the largest native Church which God has given to the labours of Protestant missionaries in this century, be floated away, like some well-built vessel, from the mission docks, where by the agency of missionary societies her timbers have been patiently put together, and sent forth well-manned and equipped, and with her flag of a pure and free gospel flying in the breeze, on her mission for God, amid the ocean of India's idol-worshipping millions.

There is one respect in which the Mission Church of Tinnevelly, feeble though it be, shows itself to be firmly grounded on the true foundation, and a genuine branch of Christ's holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. It is in its unhesitating rejection of all the incrustations of apostolic teaching which the Church of Rome has introduced. Any imitations of Romish ritual or Romish teaching are abhorrent to our Hindoo fellow-Christians. They are genuine Protestants, and regard Romanism as a kind of semi-Christianised idolatry. I may give an instance of their dislike even of harmless ceremonial. It is only a year or two since one of the most educated of our native clergy expressed to me his disapproval, shared by his native congregation, of the ordinary Christmas decorations with which the English congregation, worshipping in the same building, had adorned the church. For it seemed to them to bear too close a resemblance to the custom of the heathen in the temples of Vishnu and Siva. It may easily be gathered how deep must be their abhorrence of Rome's imitations in India of heathen festivals, heathen cars, and heathen images. It is also interesting to observe that Tinnevelly Christians are ready to hold out the right hand of fellowship to those who hold like precious faith with themselves, even though they may not happen to belong to an episcopal communion. This is a matter which has special importance in looking forward to their future. For although within the limits of Tinnevelly itself the Christians are all connected with our own Church, yet in its immediate vicinity, just across the border which separates Tinnevelly from Travancore, is to be found a Christian community, which after Tinnevelly ranks the second in point of numbers of all the Protestant Churches of India. The South Travancore Mission of the London Missionary Society numbers over 10,000 baptized Christians and 20,000 catechumens, drawn from the same class and speaking the same language as the Christians of Tinnevelly. They are also as well organised, as well educated, and have made a like progress towards independence and self-support as these have. Their ordained ministers are, I believe, as a rule equal to those in Tinnevelly in theological knowledge and in general attainments. I am sanguine enough to believe that if no obstacle is put in the way by us English missionaries, either through political animosity on the part of our Nonconforming brethren, or through sacerdotal pretensions on the part of us of the Church of England, these two large mission churches, numbering in all above 90,000 souls, may prove true sister beacons amid the surrounding darkness, each fanning the flame of the other, and as time goes on

drawing nearer to one another, until through the operation of the Spirit of love and unity, they at length blend their lights into one great Church, modelled not, it may be, in all respects like our own, but in such a way as the Holy Ghost shall guide its own members to the glory and praise of God.

I have said enough to show that the Tinnevelly Church occupies a peculiar position and demands our special sympathies. It also offers great encouragement when we turn our thoughts from it to the other rural missions of India, some of which I have named, in which during the last fifteen or twenty years, hundreds and thousands of the poorer classes have been pressing into the Christian fold. This encouragement is itself a call to us to go forward in mission effort. We have here also an illustration of the infinite variety of work in the wide mission field that year by year in so marvellous a way is opening up before us in every part of heathendom. Among all this variety, I know of nothing more interesting or more important than the training these native churches to stand by themselves in their separate nationalities, self-supporting and self-propagating churches. With many voices, then, God is calling to us, Whom shall I send, and who will go for me? Not the feeblest of these voices comes from the native Church of India. To you, especially, my younger brethren in the ministry, these voices speak. Of you also, Christian mothers and Christian sisters, these voices demand a hearing. They bid you gladly make the sacrifice of those you most dearly love, when they hear the call of the Lord that bought them, bidding them, "Forget thine own people and thy father's house;" "Forsake father and mother and sisters and brothers for the kingdom of heaven's sake;" "Be witnesses unto Me unto the uttermost part of the earth."

The Rev. Dr W. Stevens Perry.

The Church in America is the offspring of the missionary zeal of the Church of England. Coeval with the earliest attempts to colonise the western world were earnest efforts both to bring to the savage inhabitants of the soil a knowledge of Christ and His salvation, and to secure to those who were leaving their homes to found a new empire for England in the West, the priestly ministrations and religious privileges which were theirs in their native land. No one can read the touching chronicles of these voyages of discovery and efforts for settlement in Virginia, and elsewhere along the Atlantic coast, from the close of the sixteenth century, when the period of colonisation actually began, down to the middle of the last century, which witnessed the noble spectacle of a Church and nation uniting in zealous efforts to found the colony of Georgia, as a refuge for the virtuous poor of England and the persecuted Lutherans of Germany, without an admiration of the long continuance in well-doing on the part of the members of the Church of England, so far as mission work was concerned. Most gratefully does the Church in America record in the preface to her "Book of Common Prayer" that she "is indebted, under God, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection" to the mother Church; and the fact that, prior to the beginning of this century, there laboured on American soil, for a longer or a shorter term of years, and many of them

till death, nearly two thousand priests of English orders, is ample proof that in those years preceding that great revival of missionary zeal which we are so apt to date from the beginning of the present century, the English Church, whether in her prosperous or adverse days, was faithful to her Master's bidding,—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." The century of active labour rendered by the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, formed part of this great work for Christ and His Church in the West, and there are no missionary letters more edifying, no missionary labours more apostolic and primitive, than those whose only written record may be found in the old folios dating back for a century and three-quarters at the Venerable Society's House, in London, now in process of reverent and loving publication by the authority of the American Church, and seen in even brighter characters in parishes, colleges, dioceses, even all over the American continent, now active centres of Church life and zeal, which these faithful men gave their lives and labours to found.

But one thing was lacking in this noble work. Priests and deacons were given us, faithful labourers abounded, Bibles, prayer-books, homilies, tracts, were freely bestowed ; admirable works, specially adapted to the needs of the Church in America, were prepared and published—all furnished with a lavish, loving hand, but no bishop, in response to a cry for the episcopate that never ceased for over a century, was supplied. I know full well that the fault of all this lay not at the Church's door. The Bishops of London, the diocesans of the whole American possessions, confessed again and again their inability to administer a jurisdiction three thousand miles and more away. They prayed the Crown again and again for relief. The Venerable Society, as both its printed and its MS. records attest, renewed with tireless importunity the plea for the consecration of bishops for America. But political complications prevented the successful issue of these efforts, the propriety of which none but factious dissenters or lukewarm Churchmen could deny. And it was not till, with the separation of the Colonies from the mother-land, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily assured, that Seabury in Scotland, in 1784, and White and Provoost at Lambeth, in 1787, received the apostolical commission, and the American Church had its college of bishops with which to begin its life and work for Christ, fully two centuries after the mission work of the English Church had been entered upon within the limits of the United States.

Nearly a century has passed since the first American bishop—himself a missionary of the Venerable Society from his earliest ministry—began the labour of founding in its completeness the Church in the West ; and the record of the long and painful journeyings of the apostolic Seabury, whose episcopate was gradually extended beyond the limits of Connecticut, his original see, till it embraced practically the whole of New England, is a most interesting chapter of the history of the mission work of the American Church. Nor was he alone either in labours or success. The amiable and devoted White, whose life was spared till the little one had become a strong people, was not a whit behind in zealous and acceptable labour for the spread of the Church. From the first it was a settled principle that the Church in each State, when it was practicable, should have its head, its bishop. Seabury of Connecticut, White of Pennsylvania,

Provoost of New York, and subsequently Madison of Virginia, received consecration abroad; the first, as we have said, in Scotland, the others in England. The four united in the consecration of Claggett for Maryland, and ere the close of the century which had so late witnessed the introduction of the episcopate into America, the Church was quietly settled under its chosen bishops, from Massachusetts and New Hampshire at the north, to South Carolina at the south.

Prior even to this, and at the meeting of the very first General Convention, subsequent to the union of the Churches throughout the land in one organisation,—in the year 1792, we have the first missionary action of the American Church. It was "An Act of the General Convention for Supporting Missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers of the United States." This scheme, which it is not necessary to give in full, recommends the preaching of an annual missionary sermon by every parochial clergyman throughout the land, and the collection of an offertory for mission work. An address to the Church from the presiding bishop, advocating the cause of missions, was also ordered to be read to the people by their respective clergymen, while the disposal of the moneys thus collected, and the appointment of the missionaries, was committed by the Church to the presiding Bishop White, and the "Standing Committee" of the Convention, which at that time represented the General Convention of the Church during the recess of that body. In this churchly mode was the earliest missionary scheme of the American Church conceived. I need not pause to detail the hindrances to the successful accomplishment of this plan, growing out of the peculiar circumstances of an impoverished country, a scattered population, and a wide-spread indifference to religious claims prevailing at the time. The next Convention, feeling, possibly, that the scheme they had entered upon was premature, relegated the conduct and control of the missionary work to the diocesan Conventions which, with their bishops, entered zealously upon the work. Particularly was this the case in the diocese of New York, where there still remained some of the endowments for religious uses given previous to the War of Independence. Here under the faithful administration of Bishop Benjamin Moore, and afterwards under the oversight of the devoted Hobart, whose praise was in all the Churches, the Church was firmly planted throughout the large and important State of New York, the western portions of which were then for the first time occupied by settlers. More slowly, but with no less zeal, was the work carried on under the oversight of Bishop White, in Pennsylvania, while in New England, all of which, save Connecticut, was, so far as the Church was concerned, missionary ground, the truly apostolic zeal and prudence of Griswold, who, at a later date, succeeded White as presiding bishop, gave an impetus to the Church's growth which resulted in the rapid subdivision of his see into five separate bishoprics. At the south there was a slower movement, and it required all the energies of Bishop Channing Moore to effect, as, under God, he finally did, the revival of the oldest portion of the American Church. While at the west, where States were being born in a day, Ohio, conscious of the apostolic mode of Church aggression, claimed at the hands of the General Convention the consecration of the well-known Philander Chase as its bishop, elected by the few clergy his own missionary zeal and example had drawn to this distant and uninviting field. Thus in every direction, each one, as

in the days of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, erecting the wall over against his own house, without other machinery than the bishop and his official advisers to direct, and with only, save, in few instances, the offerings of the faithful as the means for carrying on the work, was the Church extended throughout the length and breadth of the land.

All this preceded the organisation of any general missionary society in the American Church. The first attempt to inaugurate such a society was in 1820, and at the special meeting of the General Convention of 1821, the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society "of the Church was formally organised, it being from the first, the creation, and under the control of the General Convention, which is itself the Church meeting by its chosen representatives, in its legislative, executive, and judicial capacity. Up to this time, the missionary operations of the American Church had been confined to the revival of decayed or distinct parishes, the continuance of the work among the Indians begun, and for years carried on by the Venerable Society, and the spiritual cure of the settlers on the frontiers. Now, missions were established in rapid succession in Africa, in Greece, in China, in the republic of Texas, and among the Indians at the west. Nor did the work at home languish. The new States at the west and south-west rapidly became sees, and with their bishops at the head made rapid advances in number and influence.

At the General Convention of 1835, the constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society was changed, and the work of missions, in place of being delegated to a society under the control of the Church, was made the work of the Church itself. Every baptized member of the Church was declared to be a member of its missionary organisation. The executive body chosen triennially by the General Convention was styled the Board of Missions. Of this governing body the bishops were *ex-officio* members, together with certain clergymen and laymen chosen by the General Convention, each diocese being proportionally represented. Canonical provision was now made for the consecration of missionary bishops. Heretofore, the few clergy in a new State or territory, organised a convention and elected a bishop, subject to the ratification of the General Convention; now, in addition to this provision, it was determined to provide episcopal supervision for those portions of the country where as yet there were no missionary labourers. It was thought that the bishop should be the pioneer, as well as the chief missionary. He was to go forth as the apostles went forth, and find his helpers among the converts he made or from the companions of his travels. A bishop for the north-west, the truly apostolic Jackson Kemper, was elected and consecrated; and the years of faithful and successful labour that followed, attested the wisdom of this plan of missionary operations. Bishop Kemper lived to see the territory committed to his charge, divided and subdivided into strong and zealous dioceses. The few clergy who came to his aid, in response to the appeals he made for help when he had once surveyed the needs of his charge, were multiplied by hundreds ere he died; and throughout the American Church no name is held in deeper reverence to-day, than that of the hard-working, faithful Kemper, our first missionary bishop. Following this auspicious choice, efforts were made to supply the south-west and the foreign mission-fields each with a missionary bishop. After several failures these efforts resulted in the selection of

the Right Rev. Dr Freeman for the former, and the Right Rev. Drs Payne and Boone for Africa and China. Thus was the mission work of the American Church fully organised. In 1853, the growing communities of California and Oregon were supplied with missionary bishops, and in 1859, the episcopate of the American Church was made co-extensive with the bounds of the United States, by the erection of those portions of the country which had hitherto been without episcopal supervision, into missionary sees. At the accomplishment of this act by the General Convention, giving evidence as it did that God had been with His Church till she had filled the land from shore to shore, the vast assembly of bishops, deputies, and spectators sought expression of their thankfulness in the spontaneous burst of song in the *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*. It was at this Convention that the venerable Kemper, now full of years and labours, resigned his missionary episcopate, retaining the see of Wisconsin, and received, as was his due, the expression of the Church's grateful recognition of his life-long devotion and service.

That step, which filled the hearts of Churchmen in America with devout gratitude to God, in the extension of the episcopate all over the limits of the land, has proved in the rapid increase of clergy and dioceses the true policy of the American Church. With us the missionary bishop is found to be the best, and, in fact, the most *profitable* missionary. So thoroughly is this conviction impressed upon the minds of the Executive Committees of our Board of Missions, that although the jurisdiction of the north-west has been subdivided a score of times since the see was first established, the Home Committee, with the full concurrence of the Board of Missions itself, urged upon the last General Convention the immediate duty of appointing a missionary bishop for every State and territory not already separately provided with one, thus subdividing the sees which were themselves but fragments of the vast jurisdiction, that, but fifteen years before, had been committed to the supervision of a single bishop. The Convention, though not granting this request in full, created four additional missionary sees at home, and two in the foreign field; while at the next Convention there is little doubt but that the desired increase of chief pastors in the various departments of the mission field will be fully met.

The question may be asked, In what respects is this policy found of advantage? The answer is briefly this. We believe it to be the apostolic mode of conducting the aggressive work of the Church. It is historically the more successful mode of Church evangelisation. It is, besides, of no little advantage in a popular point of view, to have in the newly settled portions of our vast territory towards which the stream of immigration is turning, a man chosen for his piety, his zeal, and his abilities, who becomes at once a centre, not alone of churchly life and effort, but of all the religious feeling of the new community. The missionary bishop with us does not wait for an endowment, nor even for a staff of clergy to accompany him to his appointed field. His moderate stipend—it is £600, with a certain allowance for actual travelling expenses—is provided by the Church through the Board of Missions, and it is an interesting fact, in connection with this whole question of the importance of missionary bishopries, that the stipends of all the American missionary bishops are nearly, if not wholly, provided from the offerings through mite-chests of the children of the Church. The bishop, thus entering upon his work

often single-handed, becomes at once and of necessity the pioneer missionary of his jurisdiction. He visits a new settlement. The fact that he is a bishop will secure him hearers in the rude court-room, or it may be the coffee-room of the inn, when a service is announced. That he is a bishop will encourage those who desire to secure the privileges of the Church in the community, to confer with him as to their needs and wishes. He judges of those needs, secures the pledges of the people for the support of a missionary priest and the erection of a church. He gives assurances of aid from abroad contingent upon these promises. He remains a few days or weeks, and nurses the feeble beginnings of a parish into actual life, and then, in giving over the place to the missionary priest he has called, and to whom he has personally pledged support, he passes on his way to repeat under other though but little varied circumstances, and in other localities of the vast territory committed to his charge, the same general plan of operations. Where the priest alone, unknown, and lacking the moral support of the whole Church which the bishop has, would inevitably fail, the bishop is successful, and the rapid growth of the Church in the Western States, and the encouraging fact that even before Methodism, even before Romanism, the American Church has found its way into several of these remote fields of Western labour, attests the wisdom of the system in its practical working, by which the bishop of the see becomes its organiser, and moulds it from its very inception in the Church's way.

Besides, there is another side to the question : the bishop has been taken, it may be, from the more populous and more wealthy East ; he leaves a wide sphere of influence, indeed, for one, at the first sight, narrow and of comparative less importance, but, in this self-denying exchange, he is able to make these early connections of service in his work. From his former friends and parishioners he is able to command a constant supply of means. From his old associates and helpers of various grades, he can command men. The East is ever thus giving to the West, and the Church is being built up and cemented at the same time, by this reciprocal interchange of service and grateful love. It is thus that the missionary bishops of the American Church have in their respective fields of labour done service not for the present only, but for all time. Among the Mormon settlements in Utah, Bishop Tuttle has founded his Church-schools, filled now to overflowing, built his beautiful cathedral, and planted in every direction the seeds of a harvest near at hand. In the far north-west, in Oregon and Washington, Bishop Morris has built noble educational institutions for the young men and young women of his jurisdiction, has within his brief episcopate seen his church double its number of parishes, and add to its strength tenfold. In Colorado the Church college and its schools together met the occupation of every prominent position in the territory, and give ample assurance of the addition of the missionary jurisdiction to the number of our organised dioceses at the coming General Convention. In Nebraska, cathedral, college, schools, and forty churches prove the successful working of this plan. And thus I might proceed to give instances, well known in our own land, of similar successes in the Indian work under the zealous and devoted Bishop Hare, and in short in every department of this ever-widening mission field —while abroad, I am confident, that even in England there is memory of

the labours of that faithful American missionary bishop of Japan who in a score of years of mission work had never revisited his native land, save at the call of the Church to receive his episcopal commission—and who was found not long ago by an English traveller, in his solitary apartment, with but a single blanket on his bed and another for his covering—seated on the floor by a pan of coals translating the Word of God into Japanese for the use of his converts. And I might add a reference to the recently consecrated bishop of that "independent Church of Hayti" to which reference has been made on this platform,—the Right Rev. Dr Holly, a bishop of the African race, whose piety, learning, and eloquence has been universally recognised in America, and whose future success in his interesting field is not dimly shadowed-forth already.

To such single-hearted labourers and to such untiring devotion,—there is but a single retired American bishop among all our sixty chief pastors,—God has given, God will yet give—abundant blessings. To Him alone the praise.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. Henry Rowley, Organising Secretary S.P.G., for the Diocese of London, andformerly of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa.

The spirit of this age may not be eminently missionary, yet Christianity was never so calculated to take the world as now, and never before had so much force pressing forward with that object in view. A century ago the greater part of heathendom seemed to be closed against Christianity, and we accepted that position with equanimity, not to say indifference, and as Christians made little or no effort to alter it. Now there is scarcely any part of the world from which Christianity is excluded; the power of Christian nations is almost co-extensive with the world itself; the encroachments of a Christian civilisation are breaking down the barrier of exclusiveness with which the heathen surround themselves, and destroying the faith of the heathen in their old creeds and superstitions; a perfect revolution of thought and feeling has taken place with respect to missions;—a million a year is now subscribed for missionary purposes by Great Britain, and nearly ten thousand missionaries are engaged in the mission field of the world.

In the presence of these facts it is not surprising that there should be many who regard Christianity as advancing triumphantly throughout the world, keeping pace with the colonisation of distant lands, and the progress of geographical discovery, subduing the heathen to her Divine Master's rule, and rapidly preparing the way for the most glorious period of the world's eventful history.

But there is another, and a less encouraging view of missions, which should not be ignored on such occasions as these, when we meet not for mutual admiration, and to express our satisfaction with the work of our own hands, but to strengthen what is weak, and if there be difficulties and hindrances, to face them fairly with a view to their removal. Great enterprises require a combination—a union of forces in order to their accomplishment. The extension of Christ's kingdom throughout the world is the proper object of Christian missions, than which it is not possible to conceive a greater enterprise. Yet there is no adventure in which we are engaged where our forces are less combined, or where disunion so extensively prevails. The

missionaries represent not the Church only, but almost every religious denomination that calls itself Christian. They acknowledge no central authority, they have no common bond of organisation and discipline; and in the very presence of the enemy they strive with one another for the pre-eminence. Sounds the most conflicting are frequently heard on the battle-field—it is not the tumult of war with the adversary, but the strife of many voices in the camp of the Lord. Such disorder and discord would be fatal to the success of any worldly enterprise, and it must injure and impede the cause of Christ.

I know there are those who think that the ill effects of our "unhappy divisions" on the mission field have been greatly exaggerated, that though there be no common discipline and membership, there is unity of spirit and substantial concord amongst the missionaries, and that the progress of the gospel is not materially hindered by their differences of opinion, and irregular methods of proceeding. While missions are in the first stage of their existence, and only the most elementary truths of Christianity can be proclaimed, the heathen may remain uninfluenced by our religious dissensions, because unable to detect them, but when converts are made, and congregations are formed, these dissensions assume external and visible form, they harden into antagonistic sects and denominations, and the heathen are perplexed by, or laugh to scorn, a divided and disunited Christianity.

Would to God that these dissensions found no place amongst those who represent our Church! But, though our disorganisation be not so great, and our differences be not so radical, as are to be met with elsewhere, yet our want of unity is sufficiently manifest to constitute a very serious hindrance to our work. There is little or no concerted action on the part of the great associations that are mainly responsible for the Church's missions. The principles upon which our missions should proceed are not clearly affirmed and generally accepted. It is still a moot question, as we have just heard, whether we should, as I must take it, read history backwards, and make the missionary bishopric the superstructure instead of the foundation of missionary operations. We are still disputing as to whether we shall baptize our converts before we teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded, or whether we shall wait until they observe and do these things before we baptize them; whether, in fact, we shall debar our converts from ordinances only through which grace is promised, until they manifest the fruits of grace, or whether we shall make them partakers of the means of grace in order that they may lead a godly and a Christian life. We are far from being united with respect to caste. While some of our missionaries would forbid its maintenance in any form, others would treat it as the apostles treated slavery, and polygamy also, I believe, as an evil which a higher standard of Christianity than seems at first possible to the generality of converts, will surely destroy.

Besides these questions of first importance, there are others of considerable difficulty which ought not to be left to the discretion of the missionary, be he bishop or priest, and which, I say it with all respect, our missionary societies are from their constitution scarcely qualified to solve.

When, and to what extent, for instance, shall secular agencies be conjoined with the purely religious in our missions to the Africans and other barbarous races? How can we satisfactorily reconcile the claims of Christianity upon our converts amongst independent heathen nations, with their allegiance to their chiefs and their duty to the state? This is a difficulty that is making itself felt, and as our work in Africa advances amongst the tribes not under the British protectorate, it will be felt more and more. Cetwayo, the Zulu king, when lately urged by Mr

Shepstone to grant more favour to the missionaries, excused himself from doing so on the ground that a Christian Zulu was a Zulu spoiled, that when he became a Christian he attached himself solely to the mission, and disregarded the claims which he and his country had upon him. One of the strongest positions which the early Christians held in their conflicts with Rome, was this,—they successfully challenged the Roman rulers to show that they were less patriotic than their heathen countrymen; and unless we enable our converts in independent heathen nations to do the same, whether it be in Africa, China, or Japan, we shall fail to remove one of the most formidable obstacles to the conversion of their countrymen.

Again,—most of our missions amongst the heathen are conducted upon the idea that they shall be more or less subject to the English Church: but there are regions where the people have strong national aspirations, and will submit to no such subjection. This is eminently the case with Madagascar, as time will surely show; and I cannot see that we are prepared to meet such an emergency. There are many other subjects connected with our missions, which for their proper treatment require all the union, all the wisdom, and all the resources that the Church can command, and which, left as they are, will surely add to and deepen the perplexities which beset us in the mission field.

In the face of these facts, it is not surprising that there should be both at home and abroad a wide-spread feeling that our missions are not proving so effective as they might be, that they are not doing the good they ought to do. This is certainly not owing to any want of devotion and zeal on the part of our missionaries, for in the annals of the Church no brighter examples of devotion and Christian heroism can be found than is afforded by modern missionary enterprise; but, as I venture to think, to the sectional character, and inadequate authority of the organisations through which our missionary operations are principally carried on. We need some agency above and beyond our missionary societies which shall be able to supply their deficiencies. We cannot have an apostolic college to guide our operations, and which should be able to say, like that of old, with respect to the questions submitted to it, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." But I think that we might find in the Church's representative body — Convocation — a permanent missionary council, which, without interfering with the proper functions of our missionary societies, might bring our mission work more into harmony with the spirit of the Church, and ascertain, without the prejudice of party feeling, the mind of the Church on all questions connected with our missionary work that lie beyond the discretion of the individual missionary, or purely voluntary associations to decide. In this way the Church would resume her proper position with respect to missions. She would be acting in her corporate capacity for missions; and I humbly believe that both at home and abroad, a greater blessing would be vouchsafed to her efforts to extend Christ's kingdom. At home, truer views with respect to missions would prevail. It would be realised more clearly than now, that the Church herself is essentially a missionary institution, that she is the only true missionary society; and our people would understand better than they do now that mission work is a primary obligation of Christian membership. Abroad, many of the difficulties which now sorely vex the missionary would be removed, our differences would be minimised, and with our forces more united, and better instructed, we should press onwards, winning new regions from the adversary, until the apostle's vision be fulfilled, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ.

The Rev. Joseph Higgins, Chaplain, Bombay Presidency, and Missionary S.P.G.

I take it for granted that the speakers on this occasion have been chosen as they represent different schools of thought, and that it is the object of Congress to hear the same subject treated from different points of view. It will surprise no one, therefore, if at the outset I confess that my opinions as to the way in which missionary operations should be begun, differ very widely from some of those just advocated. Those views are entitled to the highest respect, not merely on account of the character of the speakers, honoured labourers in the missionary field, but also because they are views continually, consistently, and I have no doubt conscientiously put forth by one of the chief missionary associations of the Church, viz., the Church Missionary Society. It is because that society believes these views to be the right ones, that it has so long, so strenuously, and so successfully resisted the extension of the Episcopate in India.

As long back as 1852, when the removal of the East India Company's charter was under consideration, and when the S.P.G., acting on the suggestions of the Bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, presented a memorial to the Prime Minister, the Church Missionary Society has taken an opposite view of the question as to whether more Bishops in India are either necessary or advisable. In 1856, it submitted a memorial to the Indian Board of Control, praying "that measures might be adopted for better defining Episcopal powers and the relative ecclesiastical position of clergy and laity previous to the establishment of any new Bishops." A year later, the year of the Indian mutiny, when the heart of England was deeply moved, and when money and men might have been forthcoming to any extent, the society published a statement explanatory of the memorial, which began thus:—"An immediate and important extension of the Indian Episcopate having been since proposed, and the proposal involving the establishment of several new sees over districts in which the clergy are either wholly or with few exceptions, missionaries, especially Tinavelly, the committee feel compelled to state now more explicitly and at greater length the dangers which they apprehend in the extension of an undefined, and so far arbitrary, Episcopate in reference to missionary operations."

Time will not permit that I should consider the objections made and the arguments adduced in detail; I will only say that some of them, as, for instance, that while a Bishop in England had seven or eight hundred clergymen under him, the Bishop of Madras with only a hundred and fifty in his diocese could not be considered overworked; that the diocese of Madras could only be divided from south to north, and that by thus cutting off Tinnevelly, the most important and interesting part of the Bishop's work would be taken away; that the difficulties of travelling were quickly disappearing, "so that the extension of the Episcopate is less urgent now than a few years ago, and *is daily becoming less and less urgent;*" these objections, I say, are equally applicable to the present time. But I refer to this document because in it we find the principle broadly laid down "that it is practically undesirable for all parties for a Bishop to take a leading part in missionary operations in their earlier stages." "The first need of a country," it is argued, "are missionaries and evangelists." "If a missionary Bishop should be sent out and expected to take part in the work, Episcopal functions must for the most part be laid aside. He must join the mission as a fellow-evangelist, and place himself under the control of the managing committee." Again, in 1861, on the death of the late Bishop of Madras, when an effort was made to take advantage of that opportunity for dividing the see, and a

petition to that effect was presented to government, the Church Missionary Society found themselves unable to coincide with the views of the petitioners, and reiterated the arguments already referred to. It must be conceded then that in India the views just advocated have all along been acted on; in the Indian Church we have an instance of how those principles have been carried out; there, for more than half a century, we have had hundreds of missionaries, thousands of native converts, but no missionary Bishop.

Now I confess, but in all deference and with the greatest humility, that I differ profoundly and *in toto* from the principles thus laid down. I venture to say that those principles have their origin in a low view of the Episcopacy. I do not think that as a Church we can thus delay or dispense with the gift of Bishops to our mission churches, or that we have any right to "administer as a human expedient" a thing now to be permitted, now disallowed—to be extended in one direction and absolutely refused in another—*to administer, I repeat, as a human expedient, what God gave as a Divine institution.* To adopt the words of an American Bishop, I cannot look upon the Episcopacy as "the mere badge of hierarchal display," but regard it with profound faith, with unshaken and unquestioning loyalty. As was argued by the saintly Bishop of Bombay, at the consecration of Bishop Mackenzie, "To maintain that the Bishop is rather the crown, perfection, and consummation of the Church's labour, than the groundwork and fundamental institution; to argue that the catechist, the deacon, and here and there a solitary priest, are the proper pioneers of the Church into new and unconverted regions, who must accomplish the more dangerous and difficult labour, that the Bishop may step in with state and reap the glory; to consider the Bishop ornamental rather than useful, accidental rather than essential, a gilded ornament to grace the pinnacles of God's temple, not the broad stone of honour on which that superstructure must be raised—all this is certainly not flattering to the office it is intended to magnify—and I may add, is not in accordance with Scripture, with Church-teaching, or even with dictates of worldly wisdom." I will not permit this address to degenerate into a discussion of the necessity or the advantages of the Episcopacy; I will only say that if we regard the Church as the kingdom of Christ on earth, it must have its ambassadors, and when an ambassador is sent to distant countries his credentials must be ample, he must be a plenipotentiary; if we regard the Church as a body, it must have its head; if a family, a father in God; but especially if we regard the Church as a missionary body, there must be organisation under commissioned leaders; the soldiers of Christ must be a band of trained warriors, not a disorganised rabble; their attacks, whether against sin at home, or idolatry abroad, must be a planned campaign, not a guerilla warfare. "There must be aggregation around a fixed centre—there must be co-operative aggression to seek and to save." But in India of all places we have been seeking to build backwards and not forwards, downwards from the top and not upwards from the bottom. We have been working from the circumference to the centre and not from the centre to the circumference. What wonder if our work has been strange, irregular, defective, beginning in no fixed principles, reaching forwards to no definite ends—and so it always must be, as long as the Church there lacks its natural leaders—Bishops, the heads of corporate life and diffused energy, the attracting centres and the radiating force. To use the words of one I have already referred to—"Beauty and bands, the two staves with which the fathers fed the flock, have been cast aside," and the Church of India lacks beauty to attract, and bands or union to bind. In answer to the objection that a Bishop is useless at the beginning of missionary work, because he must lay aside Episcopal functions, I would urge that the Bishop pre-supposes

and includes in himself the missionary—does not exclude and extinguish it. As an American clergyman said to a friend—"We find a Bishop comes cheapest, because he is Bishop, priest, missionary, all rolled in one." I can imagine no time in the history of a mission when the presence of a missionary Bishop is not preferable to that of a missionary priest. I am willing to cede and relinquish the argument as to what was the practice of antiquity. The committee, appointed in 1860 by the Houses of Convocation to report on this subject, confess that the practice of antiquity is involved in considerable obscurity, and that there is no certain primitive rule which applies to missions in heathen countries; but they add, "There is abundant evidence to show that when Christian congregations have been gathered out of heathenism, by whatever instrumentality, they were placed as soon as possible under Episcopal government." The Church of old, if it did not *head*, certainly *followed up*, every enterprise with Episcopal government, and invariably entrusted the infant Church to a local Episcopate. I think I am right when I say that no instance can be quoted from antiquity, of a mission Church numbering its clergy by scores and its converts by thousands, to which during the long space of half a century Episcopal rule and guidance for itself was systematically refused. The need of a missionary Bishop in Tinnevelly was felt just a hundred years ago. It is not very well known that the first native minister in Tinnevelly received ordination, as a matter of necessity after the Presbyterian, not after the Episcopal form. Schwartz found the need of native assistance so pressing that in the absence of any Bishop whatever, he himself and his companions, with much doubt and many misgivings, conferred ordination on Satranandam, the first native minister. Had Schwartz been a missionary Bishop, who can doubt that his usefulness, his influence, and his success would have been tenfold what it was?

When Dr Claudius Buchanan, in 1813, had an interview with the Bishop of that ancient and interesting Church, the Syrian Christians of St Thomas, the Bishop's mind was much exercised to understand how the Church in India was a branch of an Episcopal Church, yet had no Episcopal representative in India. "There must be something very defective—something irregular in your organisation," said the Bishop, and, I am sure, there are many in this room who entirely agree with that Eastern prelate, there *still* is something very irregular and defective in our ecclesiastical organisation in India. But let us proceed to test the principles on which we have been labouring in India, with those by which other associations have been guided elsewhere, and judge of them by their results. If the committee in Salisbury Square are right, then, that great meeting of Bishops in Lambeth, which resulted in the formation of the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund, was ill-timed, unnecessary, and unwise. Let us see what it has done in all parts of the world, while owing to the influence of society, and to the operation of the principles referred to, we in India have remained stationary as regards any increase of the Episcopate.

You are probably aware that the first Bishop of Calcutta was consecrated in 1813. Some twenty years later in round numbers, in 1835 and 1837, Madras and Bombay were formed into sees. Now, it was some five or six years later that the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund was organised, and Bishops sent to New Zealand, Africa, Australia, &c. In New Zealand there are now six Bishops, in Australia eleven, in Africa seven, in Canada eleven. But it is in America that we find the most wonderful increase. *The Journal of Convention* of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America gives the statistics of its growth from 1838 (one year, it must be remembered, after the foundation of the last of the Indian bishoprics) to 1874. Whereas in 1838 there were 25 dioceses and 900 clergy, in 1874 there are 49 dioceses, eight of which are

purely missionary jurisdictions, and more than 3000 clergy; so true are the memorable words once used by your lordship, that the Bishop is a tree "whose seed is in itself." And all this while India has been obliged to remain contented, or rather discontented, with three Bishops. I say discontented, for no one can suppose that such a state of things is pleasing to the great mass of our Indian converts, even supposing it agreeable to the majority of the missionaries. The Bishop is for people as well as priests; have the views and wishes of the tens of thousands of Hindu Christians, on this subject, ever been consulted? And if this were done, can there be any doubt whether they would not prefer a responsible ruler and appointed head, deriving his authority from the head of England's Church, to those irresponsible and self-constituted Bishops, who up to the present time are paramount. The Hindu mind i peculiarly suited to understand and appreciate Episcopal institutions. All the habits, traditions, and feelings of the people are enlisted on the side of monarchical institutions, not of democratic ones, of the hierarchy, not of the presbytery. It seems a singular anomaly, therefore, that the English Church, while it has thrown its Bishops into the wilds of Africa, among savage races, and sent them to remote islands, the territory of other rulers, has for half a century in various places denied or delayed the Episcopate to a people intelligent, order-loving, spiritually-minded, quite capable of understanding its action, and appreciating its advantages.

I hold in my hand a pamphlet by the Rev. A. R. Symonds, for many years secretary of the Madras Committee of the S.P.G., which was printed in 1856, unfortunately only for private circulation, which enters upon, and I may say exhausts, the subject of the need of the extension of the Episcopate in India. He shows how this form of Church government is specially and peculiarly adapted to Hindu character, which reverences authority and places the priest even above the prince. He shows how Episcopacy would invigorate our missions in India, giving them greater coherence as well as more power of expansion, and how, especially in relation to the native clergy and catechists, it would give them a supreme head and ruler in whom was lodged the fount and spring of action, to whom lay the final appeal in all differences.

But, it may be said, we are now going to make up for past neglect, we are going to have, as you have heard, two Bishops in Tinnevelly. I do not know whether to regard this as a subject for congratulation or for regret. We are going to consolidate and perpetuate the differences which here at home we profess to deplore. We are to have Society Bishops, not Bishops of the Church. The missionaries of the S.P.G. and their congregations are to have their own Bishop chosen from their ranks, supported by their funds, and the C.M.S. men are likewise to be presided over by a Bishop of their own.

On this scheme, however, it would be premature to comment. Let no one suppose, however, that by erecting one or more Bishops in Tinnevelly, the need of the Church of India in this respect will be supplied; in fact the friends of missions in general have been accustomed too much to regard Tinnevelly as synonymous with India in reference to mission work, and to entertain a vague idea that till Tinnevelly has its Bishop nothing else can be done. But we need what in an article in the *Guardian* was described as "a vast and almost unprecedented increase of the Episcopacy in India," the establishment of working Missionary Bishops all over the country, whose dioceses shall be co-extensive with the country covered by their immediate work, and whose clergy shall be the little band of fellow-workers associated with each. In this way complications arising from the territorial and Episcopal jurisdiction of each need hardly be feared. The Church of Rome has *nineteen* dioceses in India, and the salary allowed by the Indian Government to a Roman Catholic Bishop

is Rs.500. Is it impossible for us to have as numerous and inexpensive Bishops. We need the revival in our missions in India, I will not say of Monasteries, or even of Brotherhoods, but of the old Cathedral system of the Church—centres of light and life and unity, where there shall be distributive labour, co-operative evangelisation, and well ordered congregations, against the powers of heathendom.

Let me notice one of many likely places where the experiment of such a missionary bishopric may be tested. You are aware of the interest the Bishop of Bombay (who in the seven years of his episcopate has done more to revive missionary zeal than in all the years gone before) takes in his Mharatti mission. Here at Kholapore, the missionary Mr Williams describes himself as in the midst of a population of two millions of one of the finest of Hindu races, and 120 miles from the nearest mission station. Is it utopian or visionary to express the hope that in such a field, instead of the solitary missionary there may be a Bishop with a small staff of helpers epitomising that Cathedral system which the Church made use of when it entered the dominion of savage hordes, and subdued them to the cross.

That here in time a church may be raised, with all its surroundings of schools, cloisters, lecture-rooms, hospitals, caravansaries or hostals, in which the work of teaching and training, caring for the sick, ministering to the poor, comforting the sorrow-stricken may go on. That here, be the band of fellow-workers great or small, each may find his proper sphere; one to translate and prepare books, one to teach the schools, one to preach, one to build and plant and water, but all to labour and to pray. That here, the young English missionary, or the native deacon, may find work suited to his capacities and his powers, and in "sanctuary ministrations reverent and holy, with accessories that elevate taste and refine worship, may purchase to himself a good degree, and learn reliance, aptitude, and courage for lowlier battlefields." That here, by choral services, by daily worship, by weekly communion, by multiplied services, the baldness, the deadness, the coldness of our present system may be forgotten and forgiven. That at the ever-open door of its sanctuary, the traveller, the wandering pilgrim, the fakeer or religious devotee, may enter and hear the words of life, and bear away an impression of the beauty of holiness. Are these but daydreams, or are they realities within our reach? Ten years ago, at the Norwich Congress of 1865, Lord Nelson, after a discussion on cathedrals and their ancient uses, quoted the opinion of a missionary from India, that our work there should be carried out in accordance with this ancient system, if we would look for greater success. I myself was that missionary, and since then the words of one, whom I still honour and revere as my own Diocesan, have confirmed all my views. These are no longer my opinions, but my convictions; and a great writer has said, that "the opinions of men are light as those gossamer threads which float on the breezes of a summer eve; but it is by the convictions of men that the world is moved."

DISCUSSION.

The Earl Nelson.

After the interesting papers which have been read, the account we have had of the American Episcopate, and the views expressed by others who have been workers in the mission field itself, it will perhaps not be wasting your time if I address a few words to you as a layman looking at this question from a home point of view, but one who admits nevertheless that a layman speaking in ease and at home, must find

himself lacking in practical acquaintance with the details of the work. While we cannot be too thankful for God's wonderful blessings on the small means we have used in this work, and notwithstanding our want of faith and deficient organisation; at the same time we never can doubt for a moment, when we look to what ought to be done and what is done, that we are not so truly a great missionary Church as a Church like the Church of England ought to be. One reason for this is, that there has grown up amongst us a sort of caste of missionaries, as if they were something apart from the work of the home Church; when a man is set apart for work of this kind, he is too much looked upon as cut off from the Church at ho The effects of this state of things show themselves in many ways. Thus, when a man is sent into the mission field, he looks to settling himself down for life on his mission, rather than working to build up a native national Church again. When our missionaries do not come home at stated periods, the Church loses a great deal of practical knowledge which she would otherwise gain of the work that is being carried on; and I think that anything that would break down this partition wall between the mission clergy and the home clergy, would be an immense blessing to the missionary work of the Church of England and to the Church at large. I am an advocate for missionary Bishops going forth to lead missions, because, I believe, that would greatly help to break down this partition wall. I think if we had great men going out to head missions, we should soon have a body of young clergy willing to go out with them; and I cannot for the life of me understand, why, if officers go out to foreign climes to fight the enemies of their country and come home again, the officers of the Church should not in like manner, after perhaps five or six years of arduous service, come home without being sneered at for so doing. Another mode of securing this would be to establish a regular system, by some arrangement with public bodies and private patrons, under which it would be understood that preference would always be given to returned missionaries who had worked five or six years in the mission field. There was one remark made by Dr Perry, which, I know, was not an intentional sneer at our colonial Bishops, though it sounded like one. He said there were no retired missionary Bishops in America, but it must be borne in mind that there is a great difference between the two cases. Most of the missionary work of the American Church is conducted on the same continent, although, no doubt from its great extent, there is a great variety of different climates; but our Bishops are frequently sent to places where the climate is exceedingly bad, and where Bishop after Bishop has been obliged to return from loss of health, and not a few have died. In stating this, I am influenced by the strong impression that there ought not to be a sneer against men who come home, whether missionaries or Bishops. The only fault about it is, that it is done without a regular rule. There ought to be a distinct and well-understood rule, that after a certain period of service every missionary should come home, and then no fault could be found about it. I believe the Church at home would be greatly blessed by their presence, they would carry a knowledge of actual mission work into many a parish, and missionary work would be strengthened and prospered thereby.

Rev. G. T. Carruthers, Chaplain of Nagpore, Central Provinces, India.

I have come home from India with a definite purpose; and that is to try to induce the people of England to encourage in a greater degree the establishment of a native ministry. I am not a missionary myself, but I feel and know that the great want of

the Indian Church is a native ministry developed in itself. The endeavour of the great English societies seems to be to spend all their money on European missionaries, and it is only here and there that we find a sprinkling of native teachers. The true way of procedure in a country like India would be to send one or two Europeans into a district, who should train their first converts in every suitable case for missionaries; and when by those means a Church was built up in that district, it should be left in the hands of the native Christians, under the supervision of bishops and other European clergy, going amongst them at regular stated times. The societies, however, have adopted plans the exact converse of this. Everything depends upon the European clergy, and if our missionaries were removed from India, I do not think a real Church would be left there. It seems to me that there is not any real vitality in the Indian Church. Our converts seem to be weak and poor Christians, leaning wholly on their European teachers, instead of feeling that they are the leaven to leaven the whole of India, by the preaching of the gospel. I think of all the countries in the world, India is the most adapted for Episcopal arrangements, but the bishops she has have no patronage, there are no lay patrons, there are no endowed deans and chapters, and nothing at all to develop a Church system. I will not say that nothing is doing, but there seems to be a complete misapprehension as to what ought to be done. The other day our bishops met at the Nagpore station to consider a grand scheme, sent out by the Archbishop of Canterbury, for raising up a native ministry. By this scheme one bishop was to be appointed by the S.P.G., and the other by the C.M.S., and each was to be bishop to the clergy of his own society only, and not of the other. Such a scheme would only intensify all the divisions and dissensions existing, and I am very glad that our bishops would have nothing to do with it. I regret, however, to have heard that the two bishops who are to be appointed, are to be suffragans; but we want to have real territorial bishops. It would be a great thing, if the societies would put aside a portion of their money for the foundation of glebes and other endowments in India. It would be well, too, if certain districts were got rid of, which have been in the Society's hands for twenty years, and which have produced no results. At Nagpore, on the contrary, Christians are being made on all sides, and they are developing as fast as they can all the machinery of a real native Church. But they want help—they want more money; and the society says—"We have so many stations, where there have been no conversions for many years, we cannot give more money to help this great work in your place." I do not say a word against the societies, but I should be glad if India could be divided into dioceses, each with its bishop, and each with a large staff of native clergy.

Captain the Hon. F. Maude, R.N.

I will not enter into the differences between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the "little knot of bishops" mentioned by the last speaker. For myself, I may say, that I do not approve of Mr Carruther's plan, but take the same view of it which it appears the Archbishop has taken. As Treasurer of the Church Missionary Society, I wish to say a few words in reference to what has just been said with regard to it. I am an old sailor, but for a great many years I have been on shore, and for forty of those years a member of the committee of the Church Missionary Society, and hence it is that I have risen on this occasion to speak on the subject of missions and missionary bishops. Having been connected with that Society for forty years I had the honour of conferring with the President before he went out to New Zealand. I

will not say that the Society which I represent paid his lordship's salary, but it contributed £600 a year when his lordship went to that colony. Further, there would not have been a bishop in Calcutta but for the Church Missionary Society. Where again would have been the Bishop of Sierra Leone but for that Society? Where would have been Bishop Crowther? As an old sailor I cannot forget that a few years ago an Admiral, Sir Henry Leeke, who had rescued many slaves from the holds of vessels engaged in that horrible traffic, had, kneeling at his bedside when dying, Bishop Crowther, who was one of the four slave boys he had rescued. I will say nothing more about New Zealand, as I do not know exactly how many bishops there are there; but I know that the Church Missionary Society has been the means of placing and supporting three bishops in N.W. America, at Athabasca, and at Saskatchewan, and it is delightful to hear of the good which is being done through the agency of the bishoprics which have originated with that Society. It has been said that the missionary work in India has been carried on in such a way, that if the missionaries were withdrawn the whole thing would dissolve and melt away. I will leave that branch of the subject to the next speaker (the Bishop of Melbourne) to deal with. If European missionaries withdrew from Sierra Leone, would Christianity there become a myth? Is there not a native Established Church there, which is supporting itself, and not only so, but actually contributing to mission funds in England? Again, what are we to say with regard to China, where one of our missionaries has been consecrated a bishop, and he has just ordained a native. No one who knew anything about the late Henry Venn could suppose that he would be in favour of a system under which converts might melt away like those of Loyola, who baptized as Christians thousands who knew no more of Christianity than the man in the moon. On Tuesday, Lord Plunkett remarked that he wished to disabuse the minds of Englishmen as to their views of the Irish Church, and so I have risen to disabuse your minds as to the work of the Church Missionary Society, and as to the statements which have just been made. With respect to Africa, Bishop Crowther has planted churches on the Niger, where no Englishman could reside, and last year he planted a church, and ordained three native missionaries near the mouth of that river, in a district where a very short time ago the people were cannibals. There is a native Church there, and now it does not signify much as to its continuance whether the bishop lives or dies. Bishop Crowther preaches the downright truth of the gospel, and there is no nonsense attached to it. I have so high an opinion of missionary work, that when a son of my dear old friend, the Rev. Joseph Fenn, volunteered for it, I was almost envious. I would not advise any father to attempt to force his son to be a missionary, but I cannot conceive any more glorious or honourable post in the service of our Lord and Master.

Rev. T. Outram Marshall, B.A.

My Lord,—After the able speeches we have heard from those who are themselves actively engaged in the work of foreign missions, it may seem presumptuous in one who has no practical experience in the work to venture to address this meeting. But, my lord, just as I felt last night as I listened to the burning eloquence of those who urged us to come to the rescue of the drunkard, that the battle in which they were contending, was one in which not only the teetotallers, but every earnest member of the Church of England, must needs take a part, so I feel now that the great work which we are considering this afternoon, is one which concerns intimately, not only those who have been called to the high office of missionary priests and bishops, but surely every man and woman in the Church of England.

My lord, we hear sometimes anticipations as to the future of the Church of England, and we are told that its prosperity in the past has resulted from, and that the maintenance of its high position in the future will depend on, something or other, which, however important it may be, is after all nothing more than an accident of the Church's existence, such, for instance, as the parochial system or the connection with the State. Either of these may cease altogether, and the Church of England will still be what she is now, the voice and power of God in the land. But *one* thing there is, which is no accident of the Church's position, but is in very truth essential to her life, and that is, that she should continue to be aggressive in her Master's cause—in other words, that she should be faithful to His last command, to "go and make disciples of all nations." I maintain, therefore, that for the sake of the Church of England herself, as well as out of love for her Divine Head, every member of that Church, whether priest or layman, who remains here at home, must be almost as much interested as the missionary himself in the noble work which we are considering this afternoon. And yet, in fact, how little interest seems to be felt. How little is shown in the work of foreign missions. Where are the 1800 members of Congress who ought to be here to take part in this discussion, and to learn how they may strengthen the hands of those who have gone forth. This half-empty hall seems to show that hearts are not stirred as they should be by the call of the Son of God to fight under His banner, and win the kingdoms of the earth to the obedience of the faith. There are three things, I believe, which have contributed much to hinder this good work. First of all, it is said that men are so much needed at home, and that the claims of mission work in England are so engrossing, that we cannot expect, or even desire, that any number of our best men should offer themselves for mission work abroad. Oh miserable miscalculation of a worldly spirit! Have not Churches, greater than the Church of England, perished altogether by reason of this spirit of selfishness? Has not the Church of England already reaped an abundant harvest in the manifold ways in which the labours of her sons, whom she has sent forth to foreign missions, have re-acted on her own life at home? To mention only one instance, what does not the Church of England owe to the work of the noble-hearted and truly apostolic Bishop Gray of Capetown? His bold assertion and maintenance of the principles of Church discipline in South Africa, have done more, I believe, to strengthen the Church of England against the inroads of a desolating Erastianism, than anything which has been said or done by her children at home. The second hindrance to the work has been, the unlovely and unloving spirit in which men who are living quietly at home have sneered at their brethren, who, after ten or twelve years of honest labour in the mission field, have returned to work, or it may be, to comparative rest in England. One may admire the self-devotion of those who live and die in the forefront of the battle, but why should we who do almost nothing for the work, sneer at those who, if they do not come up to the very highest standard, at least do ten times or a hundred times more than we have ever attempted ourselves. Who are we that we should be a burden on others which we touch not ourselves even with our little finger? I was glad, therefore, to hear the Bishop of Ontario in the opening sermon of the Congress vindicate those who, after labouring a while in a foreign mission, return with St Peter or St Paul to salute, and take counsel with, and be refreshed by the Church at home from which they were sent forth and recommended to the work—that which is to them as the Church of Jerusalem or the Church of Antioch. I was glad to hear Lord Nelson vindicate such men by likening them to the officers in the army who serve in a foreign station for a while and then return to serve in England. There are many, I believe, who

would gladly go forth for a few years to give some little help in the work, if only to enable three or four hard-worked missionaries to return for a year's rest in succession, were it not that they shrank from the cold looks and unkind reproaches of brethren at home who, doing nothing for the work themselves, think to atone for their neglect by maintaining a severe standard of discipline for others.

Lastly, there is the objection raised sometimes that our foreign missions are not conducted on the truest and fullest Church principles. I care not to ask if there be a mote here, or a deficiency there, I care not to waste a moment of the short time at my disposal by suggesting that the labour of this society or that, in this land or that, are not all that they might be. My friends, are our own labours all that they might be? What I do want to say is that this excuse, so often made, can no longer be held to be genuine, when we can point to such an exhibition of Church life and Church work as is manifested throughout the Church of the Province of South Africa, and very specially in the diocese of Bloemfontein, both among our colonists, and among the Dutch, and more remarkably still among the native converts at Thaba 'Nchu. There, at any rate, you will find the full teaching of the Catholic faith, and the full exhibition of Catholic worship; there, too, you will find such an observance of primitive discipline as has been long unknown in the Churches of Christendom.

If I may mention one more point in which that diocese sets a bright example, and by reason of which it has a special claim on your support, it is that its present staff of clergy are almost entirely maintained by the liberal offerings of the Christians of their diocese, supplemented by their own private resources.

They need help from England, both more men to occupy new posts which are continually opening to them, and more money in order to extend their work. Are there none here who will answer the call 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?' by the words of Isaiah 'Here am I, send me?' Are there no mothers here who will train up at least one child to look forward to, and long for, and pray for a vocation to such a work? Lastly, are there none here who must confess that hitherto they have done nothing, or nothing worthy of the cause, to help in conquering kingdoms for Christ? If they cannot go themselves, they can strengthen the hands of those who do go. They can give liberally of their money for this the most sacred of all objects. Can a man be a real Christian who gives *less* than *one-tenth* of his income to God? Is a man giving that tenth really to *God* if he spends it all on wishes which gratify his taste or please his eye at home,—if, in his desire to add a new organ or a spire to his parish church, he forgets altogether the claim which God makes on him to extend the knowledge of the truth to those who are still in darkness? Surely we may say it is not enough to give largely for Church work, unless we also apportion our gifts wisely, and at least administer *God's property*, the tithe of all our income, as carefully and as prudently as we administer our own property, or that which we have in charge for others. May God stir up all our hearts by this day's discussion to greater zeal in helping to sow His seed and to reap His harvest!

The Bishop of Melbourne.

It was not my intention to speak on this occasion, but I wish to say a few words in reference to some remarks which have been made by a previous speaker. It will hardly be necessary for me to say anything in defence of the Church Missionary Society, after what has just been said by the treasurer of that Society. I wish, however, that that gentleman had spoken only in the way of giving positive information instead of being obliged to speak in the way of defence. I listened

with very great pain to the observations which were made by the previous speaker to whom I have alluded, upon the course pursued by the Church Missionary Society with respect to the increase of the Episcopate in India. It is not possible for any friend of that Society (and I myself have long been its friend, and am now one of its vice presidents) to enter into a defence of its conduct in such a meeting as this. Whether or not a Bishop should be appointed at the beginning of a mission is a question on which our Churchmen may properly and lawfully entertain different opinions, but the speaker might have advocated his views with quite as much force without imputing misconduct to the Church Missionary Society. The course pursued by that Society in forming new dioceses has been sufficiently vindicated by my friend Captain Maude. With respect to the divisions amongst missionaries alluded to by Mr Rowley, I think that he has exaggerated the evil arising from them, particularly in India. Two admirable papers have been read by missionaries of that country to-day, and I think it would have been impossible to tell from them whether the readers belonged to the Church Missionary Society or to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. I believe that the missionaries of these two great societies are working together with the most perfect harmony. Moreover, painful as are the divisions in the Church of Christ, so small is the effect produced by them in India, that either last year or the year before a conference of all the missionaries belonging to the different Protestant branches of the Church of Christ was held at Allahabad. Even in England itself, these divisions do not prevent the secretaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary and other societies from meeting together every month for mutual counsel. Thus there is displayed much spiritual union in the midst of their differences. As to the employment of native missionaries I cannot mention the exact number of native clergy in the diocese of Madras, but I am told by a person whose testimony may be thoroughly relied on, that it greatly exceeds the number of English clergy. This shows that the missionary societies have not, as stated by previous speakers, neglected the training up of native missionaries. Would that there was a more perfect organisation as well as greater union for carrying on missionary work in our own Church. The Church of America, which has a Convocation consisting of its bishops and of clerical and lay representatives, can adopt missions as a part of the Church's action; but our own Church has no such body; and I hope I shall not be considered as speaking in a derogatory manner of Convocation, if I express my conviction that no action of that assembly is likely to produce the good result which Mr Rowley anticipates. I trust that this discussion will stir up in some among us a desire to become preachers of the gospel in the heathen world; and incite all to daily prayer for help from the great Head of the Church for those who are engaged in this glorious work.

The Right Rev. President.

Before I close the meeting, I wish to express my great appreciation of the piety and earnestness of all the speakers, and my gratitude to the Treasurer of the Church Missionary Society, for the opportunity he has given me of expressing my gratitude to that Society for their kindness to me in past times. I can bear testimony from my own knowledge that the Church Missionary Society had the chief part in founding the Bishopric of New Zealand in 1841, and I hope Captain Maude will agree with me in the belief that the success of that early experiment was sufficient to induce the Society to repeat it. I heartily thank the Society for enabling me to add to the body of

Bishops my excellent friend, than whom no man could be more worthy to be a Bishop, the Rev. W. Williams, now Bishop of Waipu. When a difficulty arose on the question of income, as the Church Missionary Society could only afford £200 a year, the Society allowed me to join my stipend of £600 to it, and out of the two incomes to pay an equal dividend to each. If then £400 can maintain a Bishop, I trust that no Prime Minister or Secretary of State will interfere to prevent a large increase of the Episcopate in England. I wish also to express my thanks to the Society for their nomination of the Rev. O. Hadfield to another Bishopric in New Zealand—that of Wellington, as successor to Bishop Abraham.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, 6th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. Bishop Hobhouse took the Chair at Half-past two.

FUNERAL REFORM, AND MEMORIALS OF THE DEAD.

PAPERS.

The Rev. J. D. Collis, D.D., Vicar of Stratford-on-Avon, and Honorary Canon of Worcester.

Now, and for years past, painted windows have been the accepted method of showing respect to the departed Christian. Cannot we now advance a step farther? We have abolished allegorical monstrosities of sculpture inside our churches, cannot we quietly and gradually accustom ourselves to the idea that in the worldly ritual (the most worldly and the most rigid, tyrannical, and unbending of all rituals), the worldly ritual of our street mourning processions as now conducted, there is not a single particle of Christian emblem, of Christian feeling, of Christian hope. No one looking at an ordinary funeral would make out from it, whether we were conducting to his grave a Jew, or a Turk, or a heretic, or an infidel, or a Mohammedan, or a Chinese, or a cannibal, or a Christian. Would any stranger to this street mummery know whether we believe in Christ or not?—whether we believe in the joyful, hopeful, peaceful rest of souls in paradise, awaiting the glorious resurrection morn?—whether we have any belief in the immortality of the soul?—whether we have any faith in our Saviour-God? Are not ordinary funerals—plain, medium, or splendid—all of one dark, dismal, hopeless, dull, unchristian uniformity of utter ugliness and meaninglessness? Can anything be more hideous, dark, dismal, dreary, cheerless, more dispiriting and disheartening, more depressing and repulsive, than a well-conducted first-class funeral? Did any one ever see in such a procession one particle of beauty, of hope, of cheering anticipation of a bright, glorious, and unending future?

Can any one tell us who invented this awful and desponding and heart-depressing ritual? What is the authority for it? It is not, we believe, more than a hundred years old; why then keep it up as of a hoary and venerable antiquity? Will any one give us a single good reason for keeping

it up, except that it costs untold sums of money to pay for this hideous ugliness? Will any well-meaning, intelligent undertaker, or executor,—will any man of common sense explain it all to us? For instance, will any sensible man tell me what is the use of *mutes*, except that both in grammar and at funerals, they invariably suggest the constantly accompanying *liquids?* What is the use of pages, except that they suggest pages of a ledger, the items of which we shall have to pay for? What is the recondite mystery of dingy black velvet horsetrappings? "*Optat ephippia bos,*" says Horace; but why should the poor innocent horses be made guys of? What ever do the plumes mean? and why a particular number? and why white, black, or both? and why are a set sometimes carried by a page-boy on a triangular tea-tray in front of the coffin? and why put on the horses, and the hearse?

This is only one point; there are hundreds to be explained. Will any man say why all funerals are so nearly alike? Is it that a hundred years ago some man devoid of taste, with a positive liking for the hideous, the repulsive, the gloomy, a sort of compound between Mr Mold and Mr Pecksniff, invented a funeral for some rich man, Mr A. we will call him; and then Mr A.'s son, and brother, and grandson, and aunt, and cousin, and niece, and all his relatives and connections by marriage wished to have "such a nice funeral, as Mr A. had," and that the same money should be spent on their body as was spent on Mr A.'s body. And it was thought shabby (no one knows the frightful tyranny of this little word "shabby") not to be buried like Mr A.; and so B., and C., and D., and their descendants at first, and then all their neighbours, and then the descendants of these people wished "to be buried just like Mr A."

The type of funerals never varies; and with a dogged conservatism worthy of a better cause, the funerals of to-day go on as hideously ugly as the hideously ugly funerals of a hundred years ago.

Is it not time to change this costly, this pagan ugliness for something more Christian? Would it not be a relief to men's eyes, to men's hearts, to men's pockets?

This street ritual extends just from "house to grave," usually a half-hour's pageantry; and for this families are fined, at a time when money can be least spared, the bread-winner being often stricken down after a lingering and expensive illness, any sum almost that the undertaker chooses to fix "as the respectable thing to be done, sir, for a person in your father's position;" and the details of some relative's funeral are copied and applied to the newly dead. Hence such funerals as these. [Details given of funerals costing £40, £60, £90, or £100—one retired undertaker putting down "a first-class funeral" at any sum—from £300 to £500.]

Whose fault is all this useless extravagance? It is not all due to the undertakers, their customers sometimes wish it. Vulgar men like to think what a show they will make after their death; vulgar relatives keep it up, and think it shows substance, and wealth, and pomp, and magnificence. And so the undertakers furnish what people demand. *Populus vult decipi, et decipiatur.* [I may be here allowed to tell an anecdote with the less hesitation, as Sir Edmund Lechmere told it himself at the Leeds Congress. The undertaker, having put up a hatchment over the door, stands back to survey it with a complacent air, and seeing the son of the late Baronet coming out of the hall door, exclaims, "Deal o' meaning in a

atchment, Sir Edmund, if you only looks for it. Why, you see, the *h*apex points to the 'eavens, where, we trusts, the late worthy Baronet is gone; the bottom points to *h*earth, where we have deposited his *h*onoured remains; the right hand corner points to Worcester, where he spent two *h*ours at the bank daily; and the left hand corner to his *h*extensive estates. Deal o' meaning in a 'atchment, Sir Edmund, you see, if you only looks for it."] But the households of millions, who can't afford such displays, and yet go on with them, *toties quoties*, groan under the tyranny. What's to be done. "*The Church to the rescue —Ho!*" The middle classes especially are frightfully sensitive to what their neighbours will say of them, more so than the upper order or the lower, and seem unable to break through the tyranny of custom, or to emancipate themselves from a galling and oppressive thraldom, though they allow they would be glad to do so. They are afraid of their motives being misinterpreted, they dread being thought shabby or stingy. There is a latent dislike of "making a guy of themselves," if they did anything at all different from what others have done, *e.g.*, walking to a funeral after a wheeled bier, especially if there is a violet or red cross on the pall; also all men feel unnerved in the hour of sorrow, and will consent to any suggestion of the undertaker; they say "Do as you please, but do let us alone!" and the undertakers are soonest on the ground: unless the clergyman has an opportunity of speaking to the dying man on the sick bed.

Well, we want two things, namely—(1.) To christianise our funerals, and (2.) to cheapen them.

The first is the more important of the two; but the other must not be neglected.

As much, in fact, the greatest part of the street mummery is simply pagan and unchristian, at all events utterly unmeaning and unsymbolical, the christianising and the cheapening may be contrived by simple excision of many of the items of the undertaker's list. Away with plumes, whether on horses or hearse; away with velvet trappings for the horses; away with hired mourners, mutes (with their attendant liquids), pages, all the attendants that are unnecessary; for they all savour of the world, its pomps and vanity; they are of the earth, earthy. Away with scarfs and hatbands; away with unnecessary presents of gloves and silk; away with the yards and yards of ostentatious and cumbrous crape, crowded on to women's dresses [here a *Mourning Reform* is wanted, as well as *Funeral Reform*—confining crape to a strip on a man's left arm, as in the case of soldiers, and to the *bodies* of ladies' dresses, and not much of it there]; away with all death'shead and cross-bones ornaments on the coffin; away with shoulder-bearing, most awkward, either going into or coming out of church; away with the most unwholesome custom of covering the heads of bearers with the pall in the funeral cortege; away with all unreality in the conducting of our funerals; and, having swept away all these costly abominations, let us see what we can do to christianise them.

Now we adopt a perfectly heathen way of burying our dead; at least no one would know from seeing any of our funerals that it was the funeral of a Christian. Contrast this with a Roman Catholic funeral abroad! No mistake there! The cross borne on high in front, that symbol of our salvation. We should head them with a processional cross, at all events inside the churchyard; *which ought* (could our prejudices sleep and allow

Christian feeling to be heard) *to head all our processions*, to the font or the altar, the wedding as well as the funeral cortege ; what a mockery is our processional hymn without it ! we singing "With the Cross of Jesus, going on before," when it doesn't go on before. In five-and-twenty years we have lived down the prejudice that crosses in our graveyards or on our chancel gables are distinctive of any Church party, much less of Romanism ; why not try them at our funerals ? and in all religious processions ? Then a cross should be on the pall to mark that it veils a Christian's body ; a few high banners might be carried, with the name of the patron saint of the church, or of the parochial guild of banded brethren who are, as a labour of love, helping to "perform the funeral" by seeing a brother's body to its last resting-place ; or with texts to suit the weaker brethren who object to Church symbols ; crosses of red and white flowers might be placed outside the pall over the coffin lid : each person engaged as a pall-bearer, or other official, holding a gilt wand (with a small bright flag like a lancer's banneret, headed by a plain gilt cross—or IHS), all these, I should hope, will by and by be thought quite harmless, and they would tell that it was a Christian, not an unbeliever, a Jew, a Mohammedan, or a pagan that was being buried. [As to cremation, I take that to be simply pagan ; *vide* the Bishop of Lincoln's classical German on the subject.] Has any one here been present at the burial of some great Jew, or Mohammedan or Parsee merchant in England ? Can they tell us if their funerals were in the least different from our ordinary English funerals ? In foreign funerals in Roman Catholic countries, at all events, as I said, you have besides a processional cross, often the Host, carried under a grand baldachino, followed by priests clothed in gorgeous copes, pages or others bearing huge wax candles ; but whether small or large, plain or grand, all foreign funerals of Catholics have the Christian emblem well displayed and prominently conspicuous. If any of my brethren have not yet got over their pious horror of a cross, in wood or metal, or painted on a banner-screen, will they tell us what emblem they would substitute for it that would be equally telling ? I pause for a reply. I know of none.

One most important way of simplifying funerals would be to encourage *walking Funerals*—that gets rid of the enormous encumbrance of horses, carriages, hearse, drivers, men to load and unload, &c. ; also to encourage the *presence of women at the procession and in church.* What untold comfort they lose by not being present at that solemn, yet edifying and elevating service ; and all in simple ordinary mourning, without streamers, weepers, hat-bands, or scarfs. What can be yet more touching, and yet most simple and real all the while than a soldier's funeral ? Sir Charles Napier's, for instance, as contrasted with the Duke of Wellington's awful catafalque. The coffin on a gun carriage, with the Union Jack (the Greek cross in bright red crossed with St Andrew's cross) thrown over it, with the sword and cap of the dead upon it. We at Stratford have imitated this gun-carriage in our wheeled-bier, a specimen of which may be seen, either to-day or to-morrow, in the exhibition room close by, made by Mr W. Lyne, coachbuilder, Stratford-on-Avon. Custom may perhaps, by and by, allow a few emblems of the trade or calling of the deceased to be placed on the coffin lid, or something worn by him. The use of flowers on the

outside of the pall is to be encouraged ; they are bright and cheering, emblematical, chaste, fragrant, uniform to all, rich and poor, within the reach of all. And this brings me to another advantage of a walking funeral. It is the same for rich and poor, all earthly distinctions then having faded away. Why not shew this by the simplicity of our pageantry ? What a noble example Lord Derby, no less than Charles Dickens, showed us in limiting the money to be spent on their funerals to a trifling sum ! These examples might and ought to be copied by all landowners and rich people ; but then the directions must be given in their life-time ; for if embodied in their wills, these may possibly not be opened till after vast expenses have been incurred. Let us also abolish *brick graves*, which have been well designated "underground pews."

Now, let me say what we have actually done in Stratford-upon-Avon. The details of a tried experiment will probably be more effective than vague and general recommendations. (The guild of St Alban the Martyr has existed since 1856, but I have never come across it in operation.) Since we started our burial reform at Stratford-on-Avon, in 1870, especially since the publication of some letters of mine in the *Guardian*, the subject has been taken up in many places ; notably have rural deans from all parts of the kingdom written to me for my hand-bills and papers, as they wished to discuss the subject, at Ruri-Decanal Chapter Meetings.

In this way especially, and in the formation of burial guilds, such as those excellent ones at Oxford and at Coventry, and above all in the ventilation of the subject at this Church Congress, do I hope to see the movement spread wider and wider, till we indoctrinate our people with the notion that *simplicity* is not *shabbiness; economy, no dishonour to the dead.* 1. Our first move at Stratford was to publish a small hand-bill, under the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese, called "*A Few Words to Mourners on the Burial of Christian People*," a copy of which I will send to any clergyman who writes to me for it. In it we urged that as they believe in Jesus Christ being the Resurrection and the Life, they should show this belief openly, not burying their dead with a dreary absence of hope, but avoiding all worldly display, spending money saved in funeral trappings and pageantry either (1.) in beautifying God's House, (2.) advancing His service, or (3.) in helping the poor (a box for offerings at funerals being fixed in the church). Then we described the hand hearse, one of which can be seen in the exhibition room close by, built by Mr Lyne, coachbuilder, of Stratford-on-Avon.

It is kept at the church, the charge for the use of it, including cloaks for two hearses, being 3s. 6d., the men to be paid in money, without refreshments given ; this gets rid of that objectionable assembling of friends at a funeral feast, where often too much wine, beer, or spirits is drunk. We advised them to wear ordinary mourning, avoiding hat-bands, scarfs, and the like. And, as our object was to instruct, not to dictate, much less to run counter to people's feelings, we determined to do only what lay clearly within our province to do, viz., to decline accepting any gloves, scarfs, or hatbands from the friends of deceased parishioners—this was an encouragement to our people to discontinue the use of and the giving of, at all events, scarfs and hat-bands. Then we gave out that we should adhere strictly to the rubric, and as there directed, "meet the corpse at the entrance of the churchyard," and in no case whatever go to the house of the deceased

at the time of the funeral;—this last in order to discountenance funeral feasts; though, of course, we should be only too glad to go to the house of mourning (not of feasting), at any time before or after the funeral. We provide copies of the S. P. C. K. Burial Service, with the psalm already found out, in the mourners' and bearers' pews, and quietly ask them to stand and join in the responses, as the service is meant to cheer and console;—this to do away with the doleful custom of sitting with heads buried in "weepers." I always take great pains in reading the lesson from 1 Cor. xv. at the foot of the coffin, using action in pointing to the coffin or up to heaven at particular parts, and read the "O death," &c., in a triumphant, not a lugubrious tone of voice, and at the last verse, "Therefore, my beloved brethren," walking close up to the chief mourners, and addressing the words especially to them. After being present at one of the very first of our thus reformed funerals, a Wesleyan told a friend, "I never before thought the Church Burial Service meant anything; I thought it was a mere form."

In the case of children and communicants, especially if enrolled Church workers, we have, if desired, a choral funeral. One or more of the clergy, the clerk, and a few choristers, all in surplices, meeting the body at the churchyard gate. The introductory verses to, at, and from the grave are chanted; some hymns inserted; the anthem "I heard a voice" sung to simple music.

The hymns will readily suggest themselves—163, "When our heads;" 170, "Thy will be done;" 117, "Jesus lives," &c., 142, "Brief life." I always prevent the occurrence of painful gaps by reading all or part of the alternative Psalm xxxix. or xc. as the case may be, while going to the grave; and if there is any hitch or delay at the grave, I read verses enough from the Psalms in the Visitation of the Sick to draw off the attention of the mourners from the operations of the sexton and bearers. I believe we made two mistakes at first, which retarded our reform. One was, the clergy seeming to be mixed up with the undertaking part of the reform in naming the charge for the use of the bier; the other, the using the coloured palls, with the red cross and bright parti-coloured fringes at first. It would have excited less opposition had we begun with the old black pall, with white frills, and gradually introduced the other. Though the use of the wheeled biers is increasing, there is a great prejudice against "being wheeled to church on the parson's wheel-barrow." We have established a "Burial Guild" here, from which the names of the clergy are carefully omitted.

In conclusion, I feel sure that Funeral Reform will advance, as it is being taken up by Ruri-Decanal meetings, by Archdeacons, and, as now, by the Church Congress; possibly by and by Convocation may discuss and recommend it. Our plan of refusing to take gloves, scarfs, and hat-bands, or to go to a funeral feast, has been followed in many other places, and it is gradually awakening our people to the fact that such things may be dispensed with, without people being thought shabby or disrespectful to the dead.

After all, our chief hope must be in educating our people to a better taste, and a more hopeful Christian feeling, as to the burial of our dead. The bright side of death must be dwelt upon. "Absent from the body, present with the Lord," "To me to die is gain, "Them that sleep

in Jesus, God will bring with Him," "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," "Heaviness may endure for a night, but joy, eternal joy, cometh in the Resurrection Morn," "I am the Resurrection and the Life." If these texts were more dwelt upon in our sermons and private exhortations, we should have less of the dismal, meaningless mummery of the undertakers' street ritual.

Rev. James Davies, M.A., Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral.

Although there have been recent announcements in the newspapers of "attractive model coffins of improved design," it is not my intention in this paper to trench upon established modes of sepulture, or to pronounce an opinion on the reforms proposed by the advocates of cremation on the one hand, and of flower-strewn wicker basket coffins on the other. But looking back over thirty years of varied ministerial life, I call to mind nothing so painful or distasteful as the whole pomp and ceremonial of our funerals in this country, whether we regard the carrying-out-to-burial, or the refreshments for the mourners; the hearse pall, plumes, hat-bands, and scarfs, or that most heathenish of institutions, the "funeral baked meats," which precede the departure of the funeral cortege. A young curate (such is my remembrance) shrinks with exceptional nervousness from *the first burial service;* but it needs only half-a-dozen experiences of the preliminary visit to the house of mourning, the undertaker's plenary occupation of it during the interregnum caused by death, the commonplaces and compromises betwixt sorrow and nonchalance in the conversation of the invited guests at the funeral feast, to blunt all sensitiveness, and to reduce the solemn lesson of mortality to the veriest matter of mechanical form and routine. And because, in this country, we are a custom-abiding people, not given to change, but tenacious of the old ways of our sires and sires' sires, it has needed a good deal of stifled distaste, both in clergy and laity, to breed the kind of protest against the *status in quo*, which I am assisting to ventilate to-day—a protest in the interest of both—a protest called forth by the unseemliness in some features, and the expensiveness in others, of the customary and traditional ceremonial of our so-called "Christian burials;" a protest deserving support as much from those who are well-to-do, for the sake of example and Christian simplicity, as from poorer brethren, to whom the last tribute of respect to their dead has become, under the authority of custom, a tax, which it involves a serious lien on their year's income to get over. I know that my abler and more experienced colleague, Dr Collis, has fortified his advocacy of this same protest with the evidence of statistics, and, therefore, I shall limit myself to a glance at the chief arguments against excessive ceremonial and profusion at funerals, and to a few suggestions in furtherance of a more simple and inexpensive, yet withal a more impressive and solemn, carrying-out-to-burial.

Consider, first, the call and occasion for what, I must admit, has had the bias and tendency of long ages to support it, an elaborate outward expression of mourning. It will be admitted that these grow less urgent and more vague, the more we realise *His word* who said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life;" the more assurance we have that "we need

not sorrow as they that have no hope;" the more we believe that our brother or sister departed is but gone

> "Where they must take their lot,
> Till time no more shall rot
> The passive cottage, which—though laid aside—
> Like some spruce bride
> Shall one day rise, and clothed with shining light,
> All pure and bright,
> Remarry to the soul, for 'tis most plain
> Thou only fall'st to be refined again."
> —*Henry Vaughan's Silex Scintillans*, p. 35.

If so, it should follow that the excessive paraphernalia of woe are an offence and solecism to the eye of faith, and that hearking back to a simpler and less demonstrative ritual is more consonant with the belief of "a growing store in Paradise," a fuller home awaiting us in the new life beyond the veil. Pompous ritual can no more affect the departed than the multiplied folds of crape, or the exaggerated depth of black-edged envelopes; and, if we could but bring common sense to bear upon a deep-rooted custom, would argue misconception, if not vulgarism, on the part of survivors. Without commending an indifference which might imply disrespect, or pleading for no distinction between work-a-day life and the break upon its routine, which is meetly caused by a relative's going to his rest, we may fairly say that a minimum of the symbols and semblance of grief best befits Christian folk, who may withal cherish mourning hearts, and, as nature bids, nurse (in silence, or with a friend or brother) the sense of temporary bereavement. Anything further must tend to make undue expression of the passing grief a cause of hardening, by no means transient. For if it does no good to the dead and little to surviving friends, it is time to ask, *Cui bono?* We mean no offence in the answer, To the undertaker, the upholsterer, the functionary whom comedies, novels, everyday experience point at as sole gainer by those outward exaggerations of respect for the dead, whereby *corruptio optimi fit pessima.* I need not endorse all the satire provoked by a trade which is in its very nature unpopular, which is called in at times when sorrow and disturbance of household routine are antagonistic to careful looking into matters, and which sends in its bills when the bitterness of death is past, and when Christmas has accumulated conflicting claims incurred by the needs of the living. The subject has been worked by Charles Dickens and by the author of Lord Bantam; but it needs not that we should ignore the existence of honest undertakers. Still even in *their* interest it might be well to consummate a reform, which should clear them of the suspicion of assisting weeping eyes to judge of the quality of scarfs and the freshness of crapes, and of over-zeal in carrying out the executors' wishes to do everything handsomely, by furnishing at 4s. 9d. a pair "gentlemen's best black kids," which have been some considerable time in the shop. Better still, if it removed all temptation to the kind of barter, which certainly was not uncommon a few years ago, though I am willing to believe the contracting parties are improved in this respect, I mean a negotiation and arrangement between the incumbent and the undertaker for the return to the latter, unused and unsoiled, of the hat-band and scarf, which were a kind of perquisite over and above the burial fee, in reduction of his mercery and drapery bill. Herein the combination of the

clergy of districts and dioceses to decline the old customary tribute of gloves, scarfs, and hat-bands, is the true cure for the scandal and evil.

But the sentiment of survivors revolts, not unnaturally, from lynx-eyed keenness as to the outlay for the very last tribute of respect that can be paid to the deceased. "The nicely calculated less or more" is a consideration repugnant to all our feelings, on such an occasion. "Let us pinch ourselves somewhere else," is the feeling with which the friend or relative, charged with ordering the funeral, succumbs to expenses which are needless, superfluous, and of hurtful example. Precedent goes a long way in such matters, and deceased's father or mother is quoted as an instance in which the insignia of mourning were not stinted, and the conduct of the obsequies was remarkable for the very reverse of stinginess. Except that it does no one any good, is repugnant to good taste, encourages empty parade, and perpetuates unseasonable lavishness, it might be urged that there is no reason why those families that can afford it should not please themselves; but the real harm is the example, which infects lower and poorer grades of society, and saddles them with a burden which they too, in their turn, regard it as a merit and a pious office to bear uncomplainingly. It must be in the memory of most of my clerical brethren how sore a strain on the narrow finances of the cottager, or small tradesman, is caused by the retention of the custom of going to the utmost verge of cost and display for "the last tribute of respect." An imitative spirit and a spirit of pride co-operate with custom in prompting such to bury their dead with no less outward ceremonial than their fathers did, "even though divisions and sub-divisions have reduced the patrimony, and rendered needless cost especially undesirable." We know how long, in some cases, this strain is continued, and how irksome is the payment, by instalments, of a bootless undertaking for no earthly end or object, and for which no single soul can be a whit the better or happier. In the interest of the lower strata of society, even if our own tastes do not revolt from needless and formal trappings of woe, we ought to reform our funeral pomp, and preach a crusade, with the motto and watchword, "Simplicity." On the principle of *Ridenti dicere verum, quid vetat?* a shaft of satire and ridicule at the "Intense Bereavement" and "Mitigated Affliction Departments" of our great mourning establishments, might hasten the desired reform among the higher classes; but it should not wait for this. It should spring out of sympathy for the poorer brethren, and consideration of the welfare of those whom our Saviour said "Ye have always with you."

But it must be directed, *pari passu*, against the even more unseasonable custom of refreshments, luncheons, funeral feasts, or whatever we may call them, at the house of mourning; a tax and solecism, which, whatever antiquity it may plead, is justly designated "one of the most cruel and offensive of our social tyrannies." Indeed, there is great justice in the remark of one of our antiquaries, that, whereas in the case of pagan heroes, there was a custom of offering a small plate of milk, honey, wine, and flowers to his ghost, "*in our Christian country it is the appetite of the living which is consulted on this occasion.*" * Doubtless the custom is not so rampant now as a century ago; though it is not so long since, at the funerals of Welsh gentry, the house was turned inside out to find room

* Brand's Popular Antiquities, vol. ii., p. 238, *apropos* of Funeral Entertainments and Burial Feasts.

for the refreshing, according to their grades, of the numbers of gentle and simple who took this mode of evincing respect for the deceased. Not long since I visited a restored castle in Glamorganshire, which was long a ruin, owing to a destructive fire a century ago. I asked the cause of that fire. The head of the house had been brought back, six months after death, from the French town where he died. There was a funeral in keeping with his status in the county; and his mourning friends "waked" him so thoroughly, that in the night after the funeral, no one was sober enough to put the lights out, and the castle (no marvel) took fire. I am aware that this disreputable kind of funeral feast is no longer the fashion, yet still it revolts one to be so much the slave of custom as to be a partaker of the cake and wine, or often the set and substantial lunch, where, after a few formal words about the special errand for which the guests are assembled, the conversation is diverted to such topics as the crops, the birds, horse-flesh, or what not. Worse still, before custom go out, they have a tendency to linger on low levels. It will need something besides tacit disuse of such ill-timed feasting in our own rank of life, to unteach it among the lower orders, whose excuse for it is that so there arises a kind of requital for the good offices of the bearers and the other neighbours, whose often hearty sympathy and genuine kindness thus incur the imputation of a motive which is quite undeserved. Be this as it may, drinking before and after funerals is yet a crying evil and scandal to the poorer classes. The narrow margin of the fatherless and widow is circumscribed all the more cruelly, that men (for acting as true men and lending a hand at the needful time of trouble) may be turned for the time into brute beasts. I have heard it said that in cases where a volunteer corps has followed its officers to their burial, the ill-judged allowance of beer to them for recognition of their tribute of respect, has sent them home in such unmilitary trim, that the breach of such an observance as funeral feasting of any sort ought to be held in honour ever after by all such as were cognisant of it. But we shall never outroot these customs, hurtful as they are to thrift, self-respect, sobriety, and morality, by mere talk. There needs a banding together of leaders actuated by a common and systematic purpose, whom the willing-to-be-led may follow. I should like to see our S. P. C. K. and Religious Tract Societies ventilating the subject in clear and well-considered pamphlets and brochures. They would thus strengthen the hands of such guilds as have been formed, or are in course of formation, to simplify and christianise our funerals. Such have before them the task of a threefold reform, in respect of simplicity, moderation, and meeter commemoration of the dead, and in each case with an eye to example. Lay people of influence have it in their power to help in this task, by having the courage and forethought to give testamentary instruction that "they desire to be buried as plainly as possible," and by making their executors understand pretty distinctly what such instruction means in their view of the matter. They may also do good service, whilst living, by carrying out, where they discharge the duty of executors, the wishes of testators for simple burial. It is natural that "in setting his house in order," so to speak, a man should shrink from excessive detail; but I believe that were such an one solicitous to be carried to his grave solemnly, devoutly, and hopefully, he could not do better than prescribe the strictest simplicity in his obsequies. At two

funerals of persons of rank and standing in their county, I have not long since observed that the procession from the hall to the church was on foot, the bier carried by hand, the coffin perfectly plain, and the sole outlay upon the invited guests, a pair of white gloves for each. The colour, I suppose, was designed to do away with the gloomy and sombre association of the occasion, and this was a mere matter of taste. But friends and dependents all wore their own black clothes, and, had no gloves been provided, would have joined in the procession with the same seemliness and simplicity, and carried away the same remembrance of a fitting funeral of honoured dead. As regards the clergy, their part in the matter admit of greater scope. It is in every way to be desired that they should decline to accept scarfs and hat-bands; and it will be a welcome relief to them to find the invitation to the house of mourning and the "funeral baked meats" incompatible with their "meeting the corpse at the entrance of the churchyard." If, as is now not uncommon, celebration of Holy Communion is combined with the Burial Service, it is clear that refreshments at the house of the deceased are doubly untimely. Besides this, their access to the sick and dying afford them opportunities of discouraging such wasteful and foolish outlays, as have no other effect than directly or indirectly embarrassing the living. The rich may be moved to do somewhat for God's glory with the price of vain-glorious obsequies. The painted glass window, the memorial church or school, the foundation of scholarships, and so forth, are one or two forms of more abiding and fruitful memorial. The poor may be counselled to omit an expense they can ill afford, and to adopt simpler and more symbolic methods of testifying their love for the dead, and their hope to rejoin them in Heaven. One such is the beautiful and pious custom of decking the graves on "Flowering Sunday," which still lingers in South Wales, in the Forest of Dean, and in the counties on the Welsh border. Our poor need not think we preach a hard doctrine to them in discouraging vain expenditure on the burial of their dead, if we encourage them to cherish this pretty and pious custom, which at set seasons makes country churchyards

> "Lit with fond affection
> Smile with the glory of a resurrection,"

and evince a more perennial remembrance, than much more costly and exorbitant pageantries.

Upon the topic of sepulchral memorials I have not considered it part of my scope to touch, though here one cannot but endorse the views of Dr Markland in his "Remarks on English Churches," published more than thirty years ago by Murray. "Lying busts" and lengthy epitaphs are as wasteful and vain a tribute to the dead, as those which I have striven to taboo; and a kind correspondent has suggested to me that the parish church of Stoke contains samples of very simple, modest, and inexpensive tablets, in the shape of "memorial tiles," let into the walls of the interior as a sort of dado. These arranged in a uniform pattern serve to decorate the wall space, and by their modest size forbid lengthy eulogy. Obviously, however, the more high and low recognise their hope in "Christ risen," the more will the formal passage through the grave and gate of death seem secondary and insignificant in comparison with the risen life, whether here or hereafter. *Here* it will neither be

encouraged nor speeded by undue clinging to the pomps and vanities, even though they claim a prescriptive connection with the records of our mortality. Hereafter it will have put out of sight these records, it will rejoice in "new heavens and a new earth," and if ever the purged spirit recurs for a moment to its earthly past, marvel at the time and thought and cost and pains bestowed upon the dust, which is of such light moment compared with the mysteries that lie beyond it. Not that we are at all bound to bury our dead out of sight and remembrance; or that

> ——"vivis annexus amor meminisse sepultos
> Desinet,"

because we seek to limit and reduce the cost, the parade, the gloom, the arbitrary and paganish ritual of funerals, such as they have been hitherto; but that it is high time that the life here and the life hereafter should assume in our eyes their just consequence and dimensions; that survivors should look to it, that by overdone ceremonial in the burying of the dead they place no stumbling-block, no hindrance, no heathenish fetish in the way of the living; that, in short, by an unexaggerated, a seemly committal to the ground of bodies, which in the grave and beyond the grave will be all equal, we put a check, so far as in us lies, upon the idolatry of custom; dissociate "the tinsel trash of state" from so *naked* a fact as death and burial, and act upon the belief that "when our souls shall leave this dwelling," and our bodies don "Nature's pleasant robe of green, Humanity's appointed shroud,"

> "The glory of our fair and virtuous actions
> Is above all the scutcheons on our tomb,
> Or silken banners over us."
> —*Shirley, The Traitor*, act v. scene 1.

DISCUSSION.

Dr Joseph Allen.

I am very glad that this question has been brought before the Congress, because if we carefully lay the lesson to heart, some real and practical good will arise. Whatever our religious opinions may have been or may be, we practically ignore apparently two Articles of the Creed in our treatment of the dead—I mean the Communion of Saints, and the Resurrection of the Body. We seem to forget that the body has been the temple of the Holy Ghost, and that the body held once the soul of him or her for whom our Blessed Saviour died. Now we ought to feel, that great respect should be paid to the body on that very account, and I believe, that a great deal of pageantry that still exists, although of a heathen time, really arises from a desire to pay respect to the body. It is from ignorance, as much as anything else, that our funerals are disgraced, and it is in the power of the laity especially to agitate their brethren, and to improve materially our funerals. I would call upon the laity, each of them, to do as much as he possibly can in his parish towards improving it. The expense of a Catholic funeral is not so much as the expense of an ordinary funeral now. Our cemetery chapels want greatly improving, and I have found among my patients immense comfort by suggesting, that the body should be taken first of all to the church, and then direct from the church to the grave in the cemetery, and not to go into the cemetery chapel at all. It gives them an opportunity, also, of

having the Holy Communion celebrated at the time of the funeral, and this is an immense comfort to the mourners. There is also one thing whereby one may give immense comfort, by suggesting that although departed that person lives, that when you are conducting a funeral, you are simply carrying a Christian to his temporary resting-place, but really and truly that person is as much alive as before in the flesh, and also that you are permitted, if you are so disposed, and to many it is an immense comfort, to offer a humble prayer to Almighty God for the repose of that soul.

The Rev. Theophilus Bennett, M.A., Eastrington Vicarage.

We have to thank Dr Collis for a very lively paper on a grave subject, and I think he has taken the proper view. Sir P. Noel Paton, the great painter, in that beautiful painting of his, "Mors janua Vitæ," gives exactly my idea of the death of a Christian. True, death overshadows him, with his dark wing on the one hand, but with the other he opens a curtain through which springs in upon him the ineffable light of a glorious eternity. That is also the view of our Burial Service; it is jubilant throughout, and I think there ought not to be so much sadness as is frequently exhibited when we carry to the grave a departed brother or sister. The other day in Scarborough, there was a very excellent example exhibited upon this subject at the funeral of Mr Vance, once M.P. for Dublin, and afterwards M.P. for Armagh. He was carried to the grave in a hearse; the hearse was driven not at a walking pace, but at a good round trot; it was followed by six omnibuses, containing the relatives and friends, attired as usual; there were no scarfs, no hat-bands, none of those abominations which Dr Collis has mentioned; there were jubilant hymns sung at the grave, and his sons, instead of exhibiting a sense of grief, exhibited on the contrary a sense of joy. I observe an incipient smile upon my audience; perhaps I am going a little too far, and I will not, therefore, go further upon that point. I will now say a word with regard to drinking. There is too much drunkenness still at funerals. A short time ago, I saw no less than three men drunk at a funeral, in my own graveyard. There is no fear of my refusing hat-bands and scarfs, for I am never offered any; but I would be very glad to see them abolished, and also drunkenness at our funerals put down. There is another thing I should be glad to see, when we are speaking on the subject of funeral reform, and that is, that we should not have our churchyards so overcrowded as they are. My theory is, that the dead ought not to injure the health of the living; and when, as in my own case, I have seen no less than fifteen skulls turned up, in the digging of one grave, I think it is high time that the graveyards should be closed. I think it is also desirable that our graveyards should not abut too closely upon the habitations of the living. I recollect once being nearly poisoned by this. I was then a teetotaller, not drinking anything but water, and unfortunately the water was so impregnated with water from the adjoining churchyard that it very nearly made an end of me. Now these things should be attentively considered. My time, I believe, is not quite exhausted, and therefore I will just advert to one other subject. My theory as before stated is this, that the dead should not be suffered to injure the health of the living, and though Dr Collis has said that cremation is pagan, still I have read that Christians practised it, and as far as I can see, when we are talking of funeral reform, why not reform it altogether? Certainly there is a good deal to be said upon the cremation side of the question. There is done in a few hours what otherwise it takes years to accomplish. No doubt, it may be said it is a "burning question;" but still, so far as I am concerned, I think it will go far to solve all the difficulty which we experience to practise cremation, and thus reform it altogether.

The Honourable William Warren-Vernon.

My Lord,—While entirely agreeing and sympathising with all that has fallen from the former speakers on this subject, I venture to trouble the meeting with a very few words, not on the subject of reform in the funerals of the rich, but in those of the poor. As long as the poor have not in them that sense of self-respect, which will make them ashamed to apply, while living, for the out-door relief which their relations, on their behalf, will entirely repudiate when they are dead, I think there is much to be learnt, and much to be taught.

As the former Almoner of the Society for Relief of Distress, I have with my colleagues seen, in St Giles' in London, terrible cases of this—cases where the head of the family dies, and will continue for an indefinite time to occupy the bed in the one single room, in which the whole family are living, while by hook or by crook, the family will try and collect the money to have what they call a respectable funeral. The consequence of this is evident; the body lies in the room with the children all round it, and is sometimes not laid in the coffin for several days. I am speaking facts. I recollect in one case of scarlet fever, the body of a child remained in the room among several other children, without being placed in the coffin for eight days; and in another case, where a man had died of delirium tremens, his body remained in the room for ten days! When the body is put into the coffin, that coffin frequently serves for the table upon which the glasses are placed for the wake.

It was only last week, that a really respectable woman came before us at the Board of Guardians of St George's, Hanover Square, and applied for out-door relief. On her being questioned, it was elicited, that she had received from her late husband's club, the sum of £12, but that £7 of it had been spent in funeral expenses, and the remainder in arrears of rent, so that nothing was left.

It is high time for these reforms that we have heard proposed to be carried out, and if they are once carried out among the rich, they will naturally follow among the poor.

I heartily sympathise with the remarks which fell from Dr Allen, with regard to cemetery chapels. We have succeeded in establishing a mortuary chapel on the borders of St Giles' in a disused burial-ground in Drury Lane belonging to St Martin's Parish, and as far as possible, we have tried to carry out the idea, that when people place their deceased loved ones there, they are placing them in the church, and in the house of God.

The Rev. C. F. Lowder.

After the very lively speeches which we have heard upon this very solemn subject, I feel that there may be some difficulty in my gaining your attention to what I consider the practical side of the subject. We have already heard how desirable it is that the system of undertaker's funerals should be done away with. Now I wish to speak particularly about Burial Guilds, as the great means of improving our funerals, and making them Christian. You cannot very well dispense with the undertakers, unless you provide something at once to fall back upon, to which your poor parishioners may know that they can apply in a case of death. Now a Burial Guild is first of all a Burial Society—that is to say, those who belong to it subscribe so much every week or every month, in order that they may be buried with the full apparatus and materials of the guild; that they may have a solemn funeral; that they may

enjoy the privilege of being followed to the grave by those with whom they have worshipped in church while they were here on earth. Then, besides that, the Burial Guild includes the parish priest, or some of the clergy, and others who take their part—for instance, there would be the watchers, so that after death when the body is laid out, or rather in the laying out, there may be some members of the Burial Guild who will do this decently and reverently, and then who would watch in the room after death, and so provide for everything being solemn around the body. Then there would be the bearers provided from the guild; there would be the bier of the guild; there would be the funeral pall; there would be, if the clergy wished it, as in our parish, the lights which would stand around the coffin, and there would be the cross belonging to the guild, and so on, in order that everything might be solemnly arranged. Then of course at present it would be necessary that either an undertaker or a carpenter should make the coffin—many undertakers are ready to make the coffin in what we may call a more Christian shape with the cross on the coffin, or if not, a proper pattern being provided by the guild, the carpenter of the parish will be able to do this. So that the Burial Guild at once provides a means of rescuing you from this foolish apparatus of the undertakers; and then comes the Christian funeral—the body is borne to the grave by the fellow members of the guild; is met at the church by the priest and choir; with the processional cross in front and with the solemn words of the Burial Service, the funeral procession proceeds up the church. Of course very much of the service would be left to the discretion of the parish priest, but I am quite sure that all parish priests who sympathise with this movement, would desire to make a Christian funeral a happy and a hopeful one. We must not ignore the fact that there is a Day of Judgment. The purple pall reminds us of this, but in the case of the young, where it is of white there, we are full of hope and full of assurance. I am quite sure my brethren the clergy would find that Christian funerals were amongst their very best and most effective services. It is a mission service. Whenever any one dies in the parish about whom there is some special interest, you are sure to see your church full of those who desire to attend the funeral. What an opportunity you have of speaking to them, in the presence of the dead, of the most solemn things; what an opportunity of speaking to those to whom you may not be able to speak at other times! I am quite sure if we can only restore the Christian funeral we shall do very much for Christianity itself.

Mr Beresford Hope, M.P.

Allow me, in the first instance, to express my thorough acquiescence in everything that has gone before, particularly upon the two excellent papers of my reverend friends who began. I have been myself for years a practical funeral reformer, and I can state, that with a little common-sense and patience, you may do a great deal. It does not require an undertaker to make a coffin—any carpenter can make a good coffin if you give him a proper design. So, too, the graceful religious offering of flowers, whether in the form of wreaths, or better of crosses on the grave, is an act which all parties, all opinions, and all classes of society, have happily come to practise, from the Crown downwards. I was one of the mourners at Bishop Thirlwall's funeral in Westminster Abbey, and a wreath was given me to throw upon his coffin—an oaken coffin with the cross of Christ carved upon it. But the point I wish particularly to dwell upon, is to show how the Church must co-operate in the work. These funeral pomps of undertakers, offensive as they are, are yet a grotesque exhibition of the natural and right desire of human nature for solemnity upon the supreme occasion. Let the Church be ready to meet this craving. Let the Church choir be

practised in the funeral service, and let it be understood that they have only to be asked for to be there. Then so arrange your church, that either in the choir or at the east end of the nave, the bier may be properly placed, looking east and west, and the service said over the deceased. Then again, why should not the choir be sometimes the bearers of the bier? I have myself seen a child's funeral where the choristers bore it, and it was a very solemn and touching funeral. At the grave also, let the choir always be there—in fact, let the Church take the whole idea of funeral pomp and solemnity out of the hands of the undertakers, and vindicate it for herself. Give the general idea to the people, that they should go to the clergyman and the parish church for their funerals, just as they go to that parish church for their christenings and their marryings. If you plant this idea once into the minds of the people, all will go right. But the mischief is that trade, that grasping trade, of undertakers that has grown up. There is no trade of christeners—there is no trade of marriers, and the consequence is, that weddings and christenings have all along been as they ought to be, transacted between the Church and the Church's ministers on one side, and the persons specially concerned on the other. A funeral may be dealt with in the same way if you get rid of the undertakers. Any carpenter who knows his trade can make a coffin of elm, oak, or deal with the cross upon it; the bearers may as well belong to the Church as the choir, or the ringers, or any other people. The Church choir is ready; they are ready to sing the psalms; the parish bier and pall stand ready; the church is arranged by the clerk and the sexton sweeping away the unnecessary seats—above all, there will be the parish priest ready to show forth Christ's death at His own altar, and thus you have a solemn religious funeral at no expense at all, and conducted in the shadow of the Church. This as I suggest is the true idea of funeral reform; it will give very little trouble indeed to the clergy, and it will do more, it will link the people and the Church together, by bringing them nearer to each other upon the most solemn occasion.

The Rev. R. Rhodes Bristow.

It is very important that upon this subject, at all events, we should carry home with us from the Congress some practical ideas. Therefore, in the few minutes which are at my disposal, I shall endeavour to set such before you. In the first place we should strive to get into people's minds that it is no token of respect to the dead to keep their bodies above ground for a long time. Speedy sepulture is most important at the very outset. Then next, I think, we of the clergy should encourage the people to ask for a service at the house during the time the dead body is there. Servants among the rich, and friends among the poor, will very gladly come to such services, and a word in season is found to be most helpful at such times. Next, it would be very desirable if we could do away with the terrible gloom that there is about the chamber of death itself. Most of us, I daresay, remember how in the days gone by we were taken (perhaps as little children) into a chamber of death; the key had to be searched for, and the room was unlocked; and then we went in awestruck at that terrible black-looking coffin in the centre. Not long since, in visiting the house of one of my parishioners where a death had taken place, I was very much touched by the little child of the house asking me to "come and see mamma in her pretty bed." I went into the room; it was bright with flowers and lights, and there, in the centre, in a plain polished elm coffin, lay the body of the deceased, and indeed it was "a pretty bed" in which the little child had seen its mother sleeping her long sleep. There is another point which we ought to bear in mind. It seems to be an idea amongst even devout people, that it is not "respectable" to go to church during the

time that the body is above ground. Surely if there is a time when people should go to church, it is at such a time as that, when their hearts are full of sorrow. Let us then for ourselves and for others encourage the practice of going to church, day by day, just as usual before a funeral. Then again, you pass a funeral procession in the streets of London or elsewhere, and what notice is taken of it? A dead man is carried out—it might be a dung cart or a Pickford's van. Why do not we all of us as we pass a dead body raise our hats in reverence? This good custom would be much blessed, I think, if the open funeral car were generally adopted in place of the terrible hearse which it is so sad to see the bodies thrust into and dragged out of. Again, with regard to the Burial Service itself, I do hope it will be borne in mind that the service should be in the church. The church is the house of the living; the cemetery chapel is the house of the dead; and those who are gone from us are still living, for all live unto God. For this cause also, there should be, where it is possible, a celebration of the Holy Communion, choral, if it may be, bright, yet solemn, as not forgetting that the departed is a sinner, needing the mercy of God. Then again at the grave it would save a very awkward pause, a pause very painful to the feelings of devout and reverent people, if the service were proceeded with according to the plain directions of the rubric. "While the corpse is made ready to be laid into the earth," says the prayer-book, "the priest shall say," such and such things. It is not intended that the clergyman should wait until the corpse is made ready, and then proceed with the service, but the service should go on without that often heart-rending interruption. It might be also a very good thing where it can be done for the mourners, or some of them, to stay and see the grave filled in, and to know that all is done decently and reverently there. I will only venture upon one more practical suggestion, which is this:—I have been told that, in country places especially, there is a difficulty in keeping the churchyards in good order because there are no funds available for the purpose. A friend of mine has tried for many years with good effect an offertory at Easter-tide for that special purpose, and he finds that the poor as well as the rich are very glad to give towards the sustentation of the churchyard, which is always kept up throughout the year from the funds then contributed, and looks like a garden, reminding us of the place where our dear Lord's body was laid, and where He showed Himself to be the Resurrection and the Life.

Captain G. E. Wyndham Malet, R.H.A.

I wish to say a few words about a parish where funeral reform, as advocated during this afternoon, has been carried out for the last twenty years. Nobody has made any mention about the method of carrying the coffin. The method of carrying in this parish to which I allude is on a sort of platform or frame with ends and sides prolonged to form handles. I need not tell this assembly, which is the end and which is the side—additional handles may be fixed in the centre of the sides, which enable the platform to be carried by more bearers if necessary; the funeral is met at the entrance of the church-yard by the village choir, in their surplices, one of whom bears the processional cross, and by the members of the guild, who are all warned beforehand of the event. At a funeral, that took place in that parish a few months ago, which was that of a pauper, a friend of the deceased came from a neighbouring parish, about seven miles off, where they knew nothing of this sort of thing, to be present at the funeral of his friend. After the service was over he came to the rector of the parish, and he said, "Well, sir, that beats me." "In what?" was the reply. "Why, you buried him as if he was a gentleman." "No," said the priest, "we did not bury him as if he was a gentleman, but we buried him as if he was a Christian."

The Right Honourable the Earl of Shrewsbury.

I want to say one word, which is this: While we are alive let us take care that we are not *done* when we are dead. I have made my will, and particularly requested that although things should be done decently and in order, there should be no great expense incurred; because I have seen funerals, one of a distant relative, where there was enormous expense incurred; and I recollect attending the funeral of a noble Lord where I was chief mourner, and by some accident the undertaker gave me asparagus and green peas in the early morning when they were out of season. In the case of the aristocracy it has generally been the custom to give the poor a suit of clothes at a funeral. I think it is a good thing to give them a suit of clothes at a certain time, but I have desired that the clothes shall not be given to them on my funeral, but shall be given at my boy's birthday, the next birthday after my decease, not at the funeral. Any ostentation must be painful to the relatives, and painful to one's self. I say this, because I trust that it will not be thought that it is done from economical motives; but there are so many ways of spending our money on behalf of the Church, that I think it is sad that we should see any waste in funerals.

CHURCH WORK AMONG THE DEAF AND DUMB.

PAPERS.

The Rev. Samuel Smith, St Saviour's, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of Christ has always acknowledged the obligation of the command of its Divine Founder, to "preach the gospel to every creature," and nobly has she endeavoured to fulfil her mission by carrying the light of gospel truth to the "dark places of the earth," whether in foreign lands, or amongst the lost sheep of our own. Now in proclaiming these gospel tidings, one provision is absolutely necessary for the edification of the hearers, and this is, that every person must *understand* the language in which he is addressed. For this purpose the gift of tongues was conferred on the apostles, so that on the day of Pentecost, and wherever the gospel was afterwards preached, people heard in their own tongues the "wonderful works of God."

These two principles, then, cannot be controverted—

1. That it is God's will that the gospel should be preached to every creature, and

2. That the language used to convey this divine instruction should be that which the people understand, of whatever nation they may be, or in whatever circumstances they may be placed.

To mankind in general, the gospel proclamation is made by *vocal utterance*, and addressed to the ear, and to most persons, up to very recent times, it would have been inconceivable that the Word could have been preached by any other means. And yet, we know that there have existed from the earliest times, persons who have been deprived of the faculty of hearing, to whose minds not an idea could be conveyed by vocal utterance,

"wisdom from that entrance being quite shut out." Such persons were for centuries deemed incapable of receiving instruction at all, and preaching the gospel to them was no doubt considered an utter impossibility, indeed it was believed by some that they had no souls to be saved.

A few isolated attempts were made from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries to convey knowledge to the deaf and dumb, and some works were written on the subject; but it was not till 1760 that schools were opened simultaneously in Paris and Edinburgh; and only since 1792, when the asylum for the deaf and dumb was established in London, has instruction been provided for the poor. From that time to the present schools have been established in various parts of the United Kingdom, in Europe and America.

It may be well now to state by what means the deaf and dumb are instructed. The ear, "the vestibule" of the soul, being closed, *oral* communications are as utterly inappropriate to convey ideas to the deaf, as the ordinary printed book is to the sightless eyes of the blind; the only avenue to the mind of the deaf being the eye, communication must be *visible* instead of *audible*. The natural language of mankind is gesture, and by its means the infant expresses itself before it has acquired articulate utterance. Beckoning with the finger, the nod of assent, the negative shake of the head, the frown, the shrug, the curl of the lip, pressing the forefinger on the lips, are all *visible* expressions of ideas in common use which are perfectly well understood. This language of gesture and motion is cultivated, systematised, extended, and made available for the communication of ideas to the deaf and dumb. It delineates form, imitates action, and describes effects. Its foundation is resemblance. We communicate the idea of "ball" (when we have not one by us) by imitating the action of throwing up and catching one. For "egg" we form our left hand into some resemblance to an egg cup, and with the first two fingers of the right for a spoon, imitate the action of breaking the top of the egg, then insert the *quasi* spoon into the cavity and raise it to the mouth. "Cow" is represented by making the horns from each side of the head, and milking. "Elephant" by showing the action of the trunk with the arm. "Ass" by placing a hand on each side of the head, and moving them as ears. "Heavy" by appearing to lift something with difficulty. "Hot" by breathing on the hand, and then jerking it away as if burnt. "Cold" by shivering. "Love" by pressing the two hands to the breast with an affectionate expression of countenance. "Hatred" by appearing to push something away from us, with a displeased expression. These gestures or signs, technically termed pantomime, convey the "idea" then the *sign* must be associated with the *word* which represents the idea in ordinary language. The word must be written down, and the pupil taught that this combination of letters is the name of the object, quality, or action represented by the sign. A *visible* means of expressing the letters of the alphabet instead of the *audible* one is then necessary, for a more ready use than writing, or when writing materials are not at hand. Here the manual alphabet—dactylology—comes into use. The letters are made by different dispositions of the fingers, and thus a perfect though silent means of communication is provided, by which language is acquired, and instruction given in all the ordinary branches of knowledge during the five years or more while the pupil is at school. The earliest

British teachers combined *articulation* with the finger and sign system, thus by patient effort making the pupil pronounce words and sentences. This combined method is still retained at the London asylum, but many of the provincial teachers consider the teaching of articulation a waste of precious time, except in cases where the pupil had learnt to speak before losing his hearing. The German or *oral* system, now attracting some attention in England, entirely discards the finger and sign language, and holds communication by articulation and reading from the lips.

When the period of school education is over, the deaf and dumb go out into the world, and then there arises the necessity for a special provision for their religious instruction and worship, and this must also of necessity be in that *visible* language. Such a provision is as absolutely necessary for their edification, as that the heathen in foreign lands should be addressed in their own tongue, or special churches established for foreigners. This is the only way by which God's institution of preaching can be adapted to their condition. If after leaving school, they go to the ordinary oral services as they have been accustomed while pupils, they soon lose interest, as services so conducted are inappropriate to their condition, the instruction being addressed to that very organ which in them is closed; they consequently receive no benefit, and soon discontinue attendance. What can therefore be expected, unless a special appropriate provision be made, but that they will relapse into utter carelessness and ungodliness. If the soul is not nourished by a constant supply of edifying spiritual aliment, it must sink into apathy and deadness. It is, however, maintained by some, whose position amongst the deaf and dumb ought to give them a better insight into their condition and a greater concern for their welfare, that no such special provision is needed, as they can follow the ordinary service (having had the prayer-book explained at school) and read a sermon while the one is being preached. I am thankful to say that such views are rare exceptions, and that the great majority of teachers of the deaf and dumb heartily support this "special mission." I know other reasons are alleged, as, for instance, that it is a most unwise policy to encourage the deaf and dumb to meet together, as by so doing intermarriages are promoted, and the calamity perpetuated; and further that this special provision isolates them from the rest of the community, which is a wrong thing to do.

I desire to show the untenableness of these objections, and in so doing, I shall give such information respecting the condition of the deaf and dumb, which I trust will demonstrate incontrovertibly the absolute necessity of this "special mission," if it be conceded that the deaf and dumb are to have edifying public religious instruction at all. And I base my statement upon twenty-eight years almost daily contact with this class of our brethren in all phases of their existence, both children and adults, during which time I have by personal observation become acquainted with the nature and consequences of their deprivation, and seen what tends in the greatest degree to the alleviation of the calamity, the amelioration of their condition and promotion of their happiness.

To do this adequately, I cannot do better than concisely trace the career of one of them. It has been ascertained that about sixty per cent. are born deaf, and the remaining forty become so after birth. In congenital cases, there is undoubtedly some malformation, imperfection, or

obstruction in the internal ear, which prevents the organ performing its proper functions of receiving sound and conveying ideas to the brain. When the deafness is acquired, it is the result of disease, fright, or accident, and occurs from infancy upwards. Some part of the internal mechanism of the ear is destroyed, or at least incapacitated from performing its functions. Dr Kitto's deafness was caused by a fall from a great height at twelve years old.

Let us now consider the case of a child born deaf. Having no faculty of hearing, he is cut off from all the ordinary means of mental and moral improvement. With a mind as constitutionally sound as that of others, no instruction can reach it through the ear to develop its powers. Shut up within himself and excluded from intercourse with those around him, he is deprived of all those moral and intellectual advantages which social conversation renders to the hearing child. Having as yet no means of communication but a few of the simplest gestures, he cannot be told of an event which happened beyond the range of his own observation. In this state he knows nothing but what he sees, his knowledge cannot extend beyond the limits of his own individual experience. He is utterly ignorant of the past and the future, of his origin and destination, of right and wrong ; he knows not even his own name, nor the name of a single object around him, he has no idea of his immortal nature, and it has not been found in a single instance, that an uneducated deaf-mute has had any conception of the existence of a Supreme Being as the Creator and Ruler of the universe. Most of them grow up in this state till nine or ten years old, when they enter the special schools for their instruction. Compare the intellectual condition of a hearing boy of the same age, and note the wide difference. The latter has been receiving ideas through the ear from infancy upwards, and acquiring language spoken and written, at home and at school all this time, and therefore possesses information on all kinds of subjects; he is also able to enter freely into conversation by means of spoken language, and to make communication to some extent in written.

The deaf-mute, notwithstanding this deficiency of language, is able to think and reason. Some of the most intelligent of them, after education. have described their thoughts and feelings in their early years. One having seen the action and effect of a shower bath, reasoning from analogy, came to the conclusion that it was a similar arrangement on a larger scale which produced rain. Another having seen the effect of putting a light to gunpowder, imagined lightning to be the result of a similar operation. A lady has left on record, that in her early years her friends had taken great pains to give her some idea of "God," but all that she had been able to imagine was, that the name belonged to a number of strong men who lived above the sky, who printed the Bible, and sent it to us.

Thus we see that no condition of heathen darkness is more deplorable than that of an uneducated deaf-mute.

> "Prisoned souls within a land
> Where silence ever reigns."

To dispel this darkness, the light of knowledge must be admitted to their minds, and thanks to the Giver of all good, who put it into the heart of man, this visible means of communication was devised.

> "The cunning finger finely twined
> The subtle thread that knitteth mind to mind;
> There that strange bridge of signs was built, where roll
> The sunless waves that sever soul from soul,
> And by the arch, no bigger than a hand,
> Truth travelled over to the silent land."

The deaf-mute, being so utterly ignorant at the commencement of his educational career, must first be taught the names of the objects around him, then their qualities, afterwards their actions. In connection with the words all their inflections must be taught, the number and gender of the noun, the degrees of the adjective, the moods and tenses of the verb. Gradually they are taught to compose sentences, comprising all the parts of speech in their proper collocation according to English usage. Being in such a backward state on entering school, having so much to learn which the hearing child knows before going, and the process of instruction being necessarily slow, it will be readily believed that in the majority of instances, their comprehension of language must be very limited, after only five years' instruction, which is the term generally allowed. It is indeed so, for the greater part of them write "broken English" all their lives, and only half understand what they read. In such a short time, and labouring under such disadvantages, it is impossible for them to attain to such a mastery of language as to be able to read with pleasure and profit. It has to be presented to them in so simple and literal a form for some time, that they cannot become acquainted with half the figures of speech, idiomatic and metaphorical expressions, which abound in colloquial intercourse and in books. A few examples will show this deficiency. One rendered "the Scripture moveth us" literally, as if it moved us from one place to another. In a lecture which I was interpreting not long ago, the lecturer used the word "spooning," which is a very common expression amongst hearing people, but not one of the thirty or forty deaf-mutes present knew what it meant; one conjectured that it signified eating something with a spoon. The other day an intelligent young man of twenty-five confessed his ignorance of the meaning of the word "paradise." A short time ago, I was visiting an aged woman, and we had before us the text, "Being justified by faith," &c., she had no idea what justified meant. This is sufficient to show the very limited attainments of most of the deaf and dumb, so that if they are left to themselves, after leaving school, though they may go to church, and profess to follow the service and read a sermon, they will not, as a class, derive much benefit from the exercise.

But I maintain that *reading* sermons in church is not the fulfilment of the Divine command to "preach the gospel to every creature," for every person ought to be publicly addressed in that language which conduces most to his edification: and as it is possible for the deaf and dumb to be thus addressed in a language adapted to their circumstances, I submit that it is the imperative duty of the Church to provide that special means of instruction. If reading sermons be considered sufficient, let the practice be followed by hearing persons, whose state of education enables them to comprehend the language in which they are written, and not by the deaf and dumb, nine-tenths of whom do not understand half. It is not preaching in this visible language alone which the deaf and dumb require; they also need that the language used be adapted to their comprehension, care being taken to convey *ideas* to their minds, and not *words* only, which

they may not understand. When this is done, each sermon not only conveys religious instruction, but becomes also a lesson in language, and so of double advantage.

The most important testimony in favour of this special provision is that from the deaf and dumb themselves, and they ought to be the best judges of what is most conducive to their edification. I have put the question to them again and again, individually and at public meetings, and they invariably say that the services in the finger and sign language have their decided preference. In many instances this "silent preaching" originated with the deaf and dumb themselves. Some pious young man, more intelligent and better educated than most of his fellow sufferers, sympathising with them in their inability to gain spiritual nourishment from the ordinary preaching, has organised a service and taught his afflicted brethren, and at the present moment several of the missionaries in this field of labour are deaf-mutes. This speaks volumes on behalf of the undertaking as an absolute necessity to meet their needs, and it also proves that in their opinion the alleged "isolation" is not felt as a grievance. In fact, it is an utter misnomer to call the deaf and dumb "isolated," when assembled together, addressed in a language they perfectly understand, interested, instructed, edified, cheerful and happy in the midst of friends and acquaintances. The *real* isolation is, when a deaf-mute is set down in the midst of a hearing congregation to go through an oral service. Let the converse experiment be tried of placing a hearing person unacquainted with the finger and sign language, in the midst of a deaf-mute congregation, for a *silent service*, and he will realise this isolation. An arrangement which prevents altogether this charge of isolation is the "interpreted service," where the deaf and dumb attend an ordinary church, and what is read and preached to the hearers is rendered in the finger and sign language to them. This plan is adopted at some of our services in London. But for these to be suitable for the deaf and dumb, the delivery must be slower and the language simpler. It is utterly impossible adequately to interpret a fervid impassioned oration, its sentences studded with flowers of rhetoric and gems of poetry; each phrase requires a paraphrase to render it comprehensible to those addressed. I am therefore convinced that for real genuine edification of the deaf and dumb, there are no services so efficacious as those conducted in the finger and sign language *alone*, the officiating minister rendering the prayers and lessons in his own way, preaching his own sermons, adapting the language to the comprehension of his congregation, and taking all the time necessary to explain, elucidate, and illustrate his subject.

That this finger and sign language is effective to reach the mind and heart is abundantly proved. The suffusion of the eyes which is often noticed during a sermon, shows that the emotions are stirred; during special funeral sermons I have preached, a great many were in tears. Or, during a lecture, the hearty peal of laughter which follows an amusing anecdote proves that it is appreciated. Sometimes epitomes of my sermons have been transcribed by some of the most intelligent members of my congregation, and sent to deaf and dumb friends at a distance.

It will perhaps be expected of me to say something about the *oral* system of teaching the deaf and dumb, which has recently attracted some attention in London. By this system deaf-mutes are taught to hold in-

tercourse by articulate speech, and to read what people say from their lips, which is considered a great advantage to possess. I am quite in favour of the utmost proficiency attainable in articulation and lip-reading, but what I object to is, that pupils taught on this system, are entirely prohibited using the finger and sign language, and made to depend solely on labial and facial motion for the communication and reception of instruction, and it is my firm conviction that the deaf will never be able to understand a sermon from the lips. What an infinite variety of facial movement there is in producing the combinations of sounds, which occur in a discourse of half an hour's length! Can the eye follow this infinite variety of movement, so as to convey to the mind, with anything like certainty, a hundredth part of the words uttered? I do not believe it possible.

For twenty years past this public religious instruction of the deaf and dumb has been my heart's delight, having been led to undertake it by an impulse which was irresistible, and knowing the effectiveness of the means now in use for the purpose, being as distinct, clear, and definite to their eye, as spoken language is to our open ear: knowing, too, the intense interest taken therein by the deaf and dumb, and the aggravation of their calamity which deprivation of these appropriate means of grace would cause, I should deplore beyond measure the deaf and dumb of this country ever being made to depend upon labial and facial motion for their public religious instruction. Those heavily afflicted ones who are deaf, dumb, and blind, can be instructed by means of the finger and sign language; and one who attends my service, understands my sermon by the aid of a friend, who watches my fingers and transfers to hers what I say; but if they had to depend upon articulation and lip-reading, those who are blind as well as deaf would be utterly cut off from all communication.

An advocate of the *oral* system calls the "sign language" "the language of monkeys," which is a sad disparagement of so wonderful an art; of course it is made in utter ignorance and misconception of its beauty and power. If monkeys communicate at all, it is by screeching, which is much more allied to the articulation of some of the deaf. A very different estimate must have been put on gestural language by Cicero, who would sometimes compete with Roscius, the Roman pantomimist, to see whether a thought could be more effectively expressed by his own speech or the other's gesture.

Perhaps I ought to say here, in reply to the other objection previously named, that it is quite the exception for deaf-mute parents to have children similarly afflicted; marriages of consanguinity being very much more prolific of congenital deaf-mutism than intermarriages among the deaf and dumb themselves.

I do therefore emphatically declare my firm conviction, that this blessed work of preaching the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ to the deaf and dumb, is of God, that consequently it must continue to succeed, and that it will receive the support of God's ministers and people. I am indeed grateful to the Christian public, for the increasing measure of appreciation and support they are giving. Indeed, they would not be Christians if they did not; but they do invariably express their wonder and delight, that it is possible for the deaf and dumb thus to enjoy the blessed tidings of the gospel; and the work only needs to be more known to secure abun-

dant means of carrying it on. Her Majesty the Queen, the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the Royal family, have rendered most valuable aid. The archbishops, bishops, and clergy, before whose notice it has been brought, have given their hearty approval and help: and this public recognition of its importance by the Church of England, will no doubt tend greatly to its advantage.

This special mode of public religious instruction seems to have originated in Glasgow, as far back as 1822, in the form of a Sunday class or prayer-meeting: Edinburgh followed in 1830, the services being conducted by deaf and dumb gentlemen; London 1841; Manchester 1850 (which has now branches in several Lancashire towns). Since that time, missions have been established in Leeds, with stations in other towns in Yorkshire:—Liverpool, Birmingham, the Potteries, Newcastle-on-Tyne, South Wales, Nottingham, Leicester, and Derby. In Dublin and Belfast, too, services are held, and mission tours are occasionally made to other towns in Ireland. The principal of the Brighton Institution has for many years held a Sunday service in the Institution.

The services in London were first provided in 1841, by the Adult Institution, which was a society for teaching trades to the deaf and dumb: this society was re-organised in 1854, and became The Association in Aid of the Deaf and Dumb; its chief object, then, being their religious instruction by means of these special services: but it also promotes their temporal welfare by finding them employment, and assisting them in distress. It was my privilege to join this society in 1855, when I was its only missionary, and visited the deaf and dumb in the whole of London and suburbs. The efforts of this society have been so blessed, that it has now a staff of two ordained clergymen, three lay missionaries, and an extra Sunday teacher. It has erected Saint Saviour's Church and lecture-room in Oxford Street, London, and now provides fourteen services per week in eight parts of the metropolis, besides Bible-classes and lectures. Manchester is now following closely in our footsteps, having its chaplain, who is making great efforts to secure a church.

The numbers of the deaf and dumb in the United Kingdom, according to the last census, were as follows:—England and Wales, 11,518; Scotland, 2088; Ireland, 5554; Islands in British Seas, 77; total, 19,237, or 1 in 1644 of the whole population.

In conclusion, I beg to express a hope that all the clergy will recognise this "special mission to the deaf and dumb," as they recognise the great missionary societies to the heathen, and the Home Missionary Societies, and render what help they can in carrying on this indispensable work. The deaf and dumb are their own people, residing in their own parishes, and yet entirely beyond their reach for effective religious instruction and consolation. If each church would only give annually to its local society but one offertory of sacramental alms, or even a guinea, a large amount would be thus provided for this special work, and individual Christians will be only too happy, in gratitude for the possession of their own blessings, and in loving compassion to those who are deprived of them, to contribute according to their means to maintain this special provision. While such great efforts are made to bring the ungodly among the masses under religious influence, who might, if they would, find room and instruction by means of grace which already exist, the deaf and dumb must

certainly not be neglected, who cannot, if they would, benefit by the ordinary means, but must have a provision adapted to their circumstances. Victims of an incurable malady, we owe it to them to do our utmost to render them the only effectual consolation in their affliction, which is to point them to the "better land," where "the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, and the tongue of the dumb sing."

Dr Buxton, F.R.S.L., Principal of the Liverpool School for the Deaf and Dumb.

I come here to speak upon a subject, with which I have had the practical acquaintance of an actual worker, for the greater part of my life. In London and in Liverpool, my daily work has been performed amongst the deaf and dumb, ever since the beginning of 1841. To continue at this particular work I have declined calls to *higher* duty, for when offered Holy Orders in the Colonial Church, I felt that, while many another man might be found, who would be a far better missionary clergyman than I could hope to become, yet no man could bring to the special task which I should have to abandon the same experience which I had gained.

Now this subject of the deaf and dumb, though familiar to every reader of the sacred story, is a *new subject.*

The Christian Church has existed for nearly nineteen centuries. Its glorious message has been delivered, with more or less of energy and effect, everywhere. Race has been no barrier. Language has been no obstacle. Distance and climate have presented difficulties, but all have been overcome. "Its sound has gone out into all lands, its words unto the ends of the world." The deaf and dumb have been the only exceptions. Its "sound" could not reach *them:* its "words" were utterly unintelligible to *them.* That sound might go to the world's end, but it could not reach a little deaf-mute child at your own fireside. And this, to within quite a recent period. For though, as I have said, Christianity has been fulfilling its blessed mission in the world for nineteen centuries, there is no evidence that any deaf-mute person was ever taught at all until the fifteenth: the instances are very "few and far between" until the eighteenth, and it is only within this last—the nineteenth—of all the Christian centuries—that our deaf and dumb brethren have come to be *practically* treated as fellow-creatures, fellow-citizens, and fellow-Christians. I say "practically," for I have to deal with the question in that aspect only.

This is not the time or place to enter into the history of deaf-mute instruction. I have done that elsewhere. We do know, that for a long time this subject exercised the thoughts and engaged the attention of some sagacious men: and that, after a man thinks, he writes;—that what he writes is noted, and experiments are made; that some succeed and others fail; and the end is only attained at the long last, by those patient striving souls who will not be thrown off from their fixed purpose and determinate pursuit, but who have, in the poet's familiar phrase,

> "Learned to labour and to wait.'

So, the instruction of the deaf and dumb is barely one hundred years old: anywhere in America it has reached scarcely more than half that

term. And this statement applies only to the education of children; with children it stopped. Our subject to-day is far newer than even *that.* I have to treat of the spiritual needs of the *adult* deaf and dumb. This subject is barely thirty years old. I remember its birth, and have been cognisant of its whole history. As the poor deaf-mutes were so long an exception to all other classes of the human family in being excluded from mental culture through their requirement of a special mode of instruction, —so, long after juvenile education had become an established fact, they still remained an exceptional class, by being left without those means of grace which, in their case, required special modes of ministration. And the movement to supply this want is *new.* Not a century old and less, like the schools in Great Britain, France, and Germany: not half a century and less like the flourishing institutions in America; but only a little more than a quarter of a century in its experimental forms, and not so much as that, since it assumed its present, practical, working shape. Therefore, I am entitled to call this a *new* subject.

I shall not now argue against old theories, or even quote them. I will only say that the same instinct, or necessity, or advantage (call it what you will) which leads to the appointment of consular chaplains abroad, for those who speak our language;—which has founded, in London and elsewhere, churches for the French, the German, the Dutch, and the Welsh residents in those places, wherein every man may hear "in his own tongue, wherein he was born" of "the wonderful works of God"—that this same necessity (or what else) demands equally,—nay, *far more*—that the same provision should be made for the deaf and dumb residents in our large towns, after they have left the schools in which they have been taught when young, and when they have become qualified to go forth into the world and get their own living. What other class in the community do you leave to themselves, after they have left school? If school teaching can do all that is required for *them*, why is it insufficient for *us?* The commission of the clergy shows that the schoolmaster must have a successor—that the Church must carry on to the end of life what the School has awakened at its beginning.

This is plain enough now. It is a mere truism. But in respect to the deaf and dumb it was a *discovery.* Surely *they* require religious comfort, and opportunities of devotion, *as much as* any class of foreigners! *That* will probably be admitted readily. But I am not satisfied with that admission. I say, that they require them *far more* than any other class whatever: and my task will not be fully accomplished to-day unless I prove it. Compare them with foreigners! All foreigners have a spoken language. They have none. Language is a means (and the chief means) of *im*pression, as well as a vehicle of *ex*pression; and men who talk together, or who read a language which they know, are adding to their stores of knowledge every hour. They can also tell their troubles and receive comfort through the same medium. How few can talk in this strain to the deaf and dumb! Theirs is a life-long affliction, of which the physical incidence is the very smallest part. The mental privation which it involves is simply terrible. You will find it extremely difficult to realise it. It cuts off from all profitable knowledge of "the life that now is;" and from all "*saving knowledge*" of the "life which is to come." Can you not conceive a yearning sensitive soul, to whom education has brought a painful consciousness of the loss and

burden of being deaf and dumb which must for ever cling to "the body of this death,"—for which there can be no consolation possible but that which our divine religion affords, in "the peace which passeth all understanding."

If I have at all succeeded in describing the condition I have imagined, I have proved that while all the sons of Adam require, and must seek in religion our supreme consolation in "trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity," the deaf and dumb, as stricken more, and more heavily, require religious consolation more than any other branch of the human family.

And how is this to be given them?—I answer in the words of the Article (xxiv.) "In a tongue understanded of the people"—in their own language—signs and gestures as expressing *general* ideas, and the finger language (the manual alphabet) as expressing more definitely proper names, and precise statements of doctrine or of fact.*

Now this language can only be acquired by living and mixing with the deaf and dumb. Those use it best who have acquired it early in life, as teachers in the various institutions for the young, and have learned to use it with as much readiness as their own mother tongue. In some instances, the better educated deaf-mutes themselves can, and do, render very good service, in *keeping up* the work: but it should be well organised, and well supervised, by men specially called to it, and specially set apart for its performance. They should be clergymen, undoubtedly. For, how can a higher need be adequately met by a lower ministration? There is no answer to that question but the old one—"*Necessitas non habet legem.*" You should *have* clergymen: but where are you to get them? Three who had gained their special aptitude for this work, in the manner pointed out, as teachers in institutions for the deaf and dumb, have been ordained for this special work by the Archbishop of Canterbury when Bishop of London, by his successor in that See, the present Bishop, and by the Bishop of Manchester, respectively. I think I know of three, perhaps four, other clergymen, and no more, in all England, who could administer consolation and the Holy Communion to the deaf and dumb in their own language of signs. "But what are they among so many?"

So then, if we want clergymen, but cannot get them, we must accept what we *can* get. I must own that, at this point, the Church principles of my early manhood held out for a long time. My feeling was, that the deepest need required the highest consolations, and that, according to the laws and order of the Church, these could only be dispensed by those who were duly called and sent "to minister the Word and Sacraments." But, when the matter was presented to me, and pressed upon me again and again in a manner which, expressed in words, meant this, "This work is crying out for a worker. There is no one who *can* do it here but you. Dare you refuse?" my principles gave way to the necessity, and for eleven years and a-half I have regularly done my best (in addition to the duties of the week) to afford the privileges of divine worship, and to exhort and instruct, as best I might (very often in other words than my

* At this point the reader, in order to carry the illustrations of the previous speaker into the higher region of devotional expression, repeated in the language of signs, the Collect used, during the Congress week, in the daily service—that for the 19th Sunday after Trinity.

own), my old pupils, and other deaf and dumb neighbours in the town and neighbourhood of Liverpool. It is not the *best* which *might* be done, but it is certainly the best which can be done at present. And I have, at least, the satisfaction of knowing that my irregularity is not only (as I think) justified by necessity, but it has the approval of my own clergyman, the incumbent of the district in which the service is held, of the Rector of the parish of Liverpool, and the Bishop of the diocese. ("*Cum his errare*," is something.) And with all these, I am a little more content to transgress the laws of the Church to which I belong than I was at first.

But do I recommend this plan before all others? By no means. It certainly has the merit of economy, for it costs nothing. But "our poverty and not our will consents" to this arrangement. Where men can be found, and funds can be raised (the second being in my judgment a far easier matter than the first), I claim for the deaf and dumb churchman, as for every other churchman, the privilege and the consolation of an ordained ministry. That movement has begun, is advancing, and will advance. *It* is *the* means to be aimed at. Mine is but a substitute, perhaps in Liverpool the best which is attainable, because most of the people have been my own pupils, and to all of them I naturally stand in a more intimate and influential position than could ever be attained by any other living man. It may, therefore, last my time. I hope it will not survive me.

I have thus shown which is the "more excellent way" I should desire to follow. But I would not stop there. As our Church is—1st, Parochial, 2d, Diocesan, 3d, Provincial, 4th, National, so I would have the ministry to the deaf and dumb to be a united, not a separated, independent agency. No society should be exclusively local and individual, it should be fraternal and sympathetic. It should also bear something of the filial relation which comes of wise discretion, and is the correlative of efficient superintendence.

It is not strange that others who have had their attention drawn to the same subject, though under very different circumstances, should have arrived at the same conclusions as myself; but it is another instance of what so many of us know, that while we here, in England, are considering the wisdom of our theories, our friends across the Atlantic are testing them by practice. I hold in my hand the Second Annual Report of the Church Mission to Deaf-mutes in the United States of America, for the year 1874, and I find Dr Thomas Gallaudet and Dr Frances Clere, bearers of names the most illustrious in the history of deaf-mute education, and each of them the son of one deaf-mute parent, have been engaged, with two clerical colleagues and six lay associates, some, if not the whole of them, licensed by bishops to act as "lay readers," though some are deaf and dumb, in prosecuting this mission, which is conducted under the general superintendence of the Rev. Dr Gallaudet in the principal cities of the States, with great acceptance and success. For this and kindred objects large funds are raised, the income for last year for the mission alone having amounted to upwards of 5000 dollars. We rejoice at their success, and wish them God-speed in their work. If "one touch of nature makes the whole world kin," surely the kinship of a common natural affliction like deafness, should make its subjects brothers everywhere; and it does so. Nor should *we* be so indifferent to it as we are. Indifference arises only

from want of thought and knowledge. To spread such knowledge I have always held to be a very essential part of my duty. The privilege and the responsibility of the present opportunity are great and unexampled; and I am thankful that among the services which, for thirty years, I have striven to render to this afflicted class, I have been allowed, in the hearing of this great Congress of the Church of England, to "open my mouth for the dumb" (Prov. xxxi. 8).

ADDRESS.

The Rev. G. A. W. Downing, Chaplain of the Deaf and Dumb Society, Manchester.

My friend Mr Smith told you in his opening remarks, that he had spent twenty-eight years among the deaf and dumb as man and boy, and I thought it rather a singular coincidence, that that is just the very time that I too have spent, first as a teacher in a Deaf and Dumb Institution, then as missionary in connection with him in the Association in London, and now as the representative of the Manchester Deaf and Dumb Society. Now the previous speakers, having cleared away all possible objections that can be raised against these special services, and answered them in the most unanswerable manner, it only remains for me to endorse what they have said, and endeavour to show you by the work which we have been able to do in Manchester, what the Church can do for the deaf and dumb, and then I hope to close my remarks by endeavouring to put before you what the Church ought to do still more. With regard to Manchester, we will take seven years ago, just seven years ago Manchester and those towns ranging round about it, Bolton, Oldham, Bury, Stockport and Ashton, those large centres of industry, where the deaf and dumb congregate in considerable numbers; how many services do you think were provided for those towns, and for all the deaf and dumb living in them? You will be amazed perhaps to hear that we had only *one!* that service which was conducted in Manchester; and then year by year one mission after another was opened, until now, taking Manchester as a centre, the Mother Church as it were, we have her daughters ranging round about her within a circle of ten miles. Hence not only in Manchester, but in six of those outlying districts, services are regularly conducted for our afflicted brethren. There is a remarkable thing too, with regard to these services which I wish this meeting to bear in mind. When you go forth on behalf of a missionary society, when you go to Africa, America, or elsewhere, what do you do? You bring the gospel to the heathen, and you impress the heathen with the necessity of receiving it. You, as it were, force the gospel upon them. I mean in the same sense in which the command was given, "Compel them to come in, that my house may be filled." With regard to the deaf and dumb it is a different thing altogether. In every case that I speak of, the deaf and dumb have either sent written petitions, or they have come to me personally, and begged that these services might be established. But the question may arise, do they appreciate those services? I am not going to impose a number of statistics upon you; but I must just give you a few to show how these services are appreciated. Now in that immense parish, comprising such a large area as I have described, there are about 350 deaf and dumb people under my charge, and the average attendance during the last year was about 140. Now remembering that these deaf and dumb people are scattered here and there, that they are, generally speaking, of the working

class who cannot on a wet or cold Sunday command a cab, that many of them have neither mackintosh nor umbrella or perhaps over-coat to cover them, and if they come, they have to sit for an hour and a half in their wet clothes, I leave you to judge whether that is not a very fair attendance. To show still further, that these services are appreciated by the deaf and dumb, I will read you one or two little letters (and the very appearance of those letters shows that they are genuine), which I have received from time to time, and will of themselves be a test of the value which the deaf and dumb place upon these services: here is one,—"I visited poor Feeney yesterday, and found he was getting very weak—the matron of the hospital told me he could not last very long. He wishes you to go and administer the sacrament to him, and help him to make his will, and I told him I would mention the fact to you." Take another case, that of a poor woman whom I visited on Saturday last, and who sent me this slip of paper a short time ago:—"Rev. and Dear Sir, in your prayers for all conditions of men, will you kindly remember me? Pray that God in His own good time will be pleased to restore me to health and strength, and spare me to my husband and little one." I will take another case, in Oldham, of a youth who was dying. His father writes,—"My Dear Sir, I have seen my son James last night; my wife has been to see him this evening. He tried to write to you this afternoon, but he could not do so. He told my wife to tell me to write to you to come and help him to pray." Take another case; I will read it exactly in the language in which it was sent:—"Please you come to my house for I am very ill as I am in the bed and receiving medicines from the Infirmary where I went there about two and a half weeks ago, I hope that God will bless me." I am reminded that I have not only to speak of Manchester, but also of the "regions beyond," if you can consider Ireland in that light. This summer I was requested, during my holidays, to take a missionary tour through Ireland. Now in Ireland they have 5000 deaf and dumb people, and the only provision that is made for them that I know of is a society in Dublin something like what we have in Manchester, London, and Liverpool, and a society in Belfast, but there is nothing else done for all these people (I am now referring to the adult deaf and dumb) throughout the length and breadth of the Emerald Isle, except what a kind-hearted lady living in a corner of the county Donegal does, who writes to those who are scattered about for miles round, gives them questions on religious subjects, asks them to reply to her, and by way of stimulating them to write and keep up their knowledge, gives them prizes at the end of the year. Having just held a service at St Ann's Church, Dublin, I went across the country to Ballyshannon. This good lady had sent for the deaf and dumb for miles round, they were collected in the parish church, and there a service was held in the finger and sign language. We had a meeting afterwards and they returned to their own homes the next day. But look at the condition of those poor deaf and dumb people! Just fancy you and I having only one sermon in the year, and having only one opportunity during the whole twelve months of meeting together for the worship of God. With regard to the services there, I will just read you one part of a letter which was sent to this lady after the service:—"The Rev. Mr Downing says that I must not be afraid to die, because Jesus will save me from hell, and I must believe on Jesus. I said to the Rev. Mr Downing that Jesus died for me, and because God gave His only-begotten Son to redeem me and to save me that I should not be punished but have life everlasting." That is quite enough to show the nature of the work that we were doing among the adult deaf and dumb. Now I must remember the question which is before the meeting,—"Church work among the deaf and dumb." Has the Church done all that she ought to do amongst these people? It is all very well for Mr Smith

to be able to tell what he is doing in London; it is all very well for myself to be able to tell what we are doing in Manchester and the surrounding districts; but I ask you what are we amongst so many? There are districts here and there throughout the length and breadth of our land that have no such provision made for these cases, and let me tell you this, that if the Church of England will not take the question up, it will be taken up for her by persons over whom she can have no control, and whose religious teaching you have no means of testing whether it is not simply in accordance with the teaching of the Church, but whether it is in accordance with the Scriptures at all. There will be self-appointed teachers coming amongst the deaf and dumb. It may be all very well to have committees here and there, but let me tell you that committees are of no use to test the qualifications of such a man, unless a member of the committee is himself, like Dr Buxton, a person who understands what is required, and is practically acquainted with the subject. Am I talking beyond the mark? I will give you a proof of what I say. I have copied out here some of the teachings of one of these self-constituted teachers—I know him well—he has no connection with the Church; nor is he under the control of any authority in the Church. Here is part of his sermon. It was a funeral one:—"All the mountains falling, all the seas boiling, all the stars dropping, all the heavens rolling, all the earth vanishing, angels flying, graves bursting, dead rising, thrones falling and God coming, a day of great noise, the artillery of God at work, the howl of the wind, the blowing of the trumpet, the groans of the punished, the cry of the wild beasts frightened from their lair." Just fancy that kind of teaching to poor deaf and dumb people! It may suit the tastes of our transatlantic cousins, but it does not suit the sober deportment of our English congregations.

In conclusion, I would say, let the Church take this question up in the same spirit in which other subjects are dealt with; let means be supplied to the societies which already exist, which will enable them to provide regularly-ordained pastors for our adult deaf and dumb people who are congregated in the great centres of our manufacturing districts; and thus give to our afflicted brethren the preaching of the gospel in their "own language" by men who have been duly called and sent, and of whose orthodoxy and suitability you have a sufficient guarantee. Then, and then only, can it be said that "Church work amongst the deaf and dumb" is being properly carried out.

DISCUSSION.

Mr Councillor Croston, Manchester.

Mr Smith, in his paper this afternoon, took as his text the divine command that we should proclaim the gospel to every creature, and I rejoice to think that this country has recognised the responsibility of conveying the light of Christian truth to the multitude of the isles and to the remotest corners of the earth; but while we do that I am afraid we are sometimes apt to forget that there is a class at our very doors for whom the means of grace have not been provided, and who, by the very misfortune from which they suffer, are prevented from making an appeal for that assistance and that sympathy which they have a special claim upon Churchmen, and indeed upon all Christian people for. There is a special duty on the part of Christian men to aid in the amelioration of the physical and mental defects from which they suffer at the present time. Happily these mute people, though deprived of the power of speech, have no lack of mental vigour; it is only that one of the channels through

which information is conveyed to the mind is closed ; they have a language of their own, an inarticulate speech by which they can converse by signs and gestures and expression, and thus speak the language of the heart and of the affections. Happily there are Institutions in which these unfortunate deaf and dumb people may obtain an early training ; but when they leave them, they are thrown upon the world with scarcely a friend, with whom they can interchange thoughts and ideas or converse intelligibly, to take them in hand, and just at the perilous period of their lives, when they are beginning to throw off responsibility and are especially open to the snares and temptations of the world. I am very glad to have an opportunity this afternoon of bearing testimony to the excellent work that is being done in the Manchester district by the Institution of which Mr Downing is himself the chaplain. Until that Institution was formed some twenty years ago, the deaf and dumb had no means of mental culture, and they would have been at immeasurable disadvantage as compared with others, but for the friends of the Institution taking them by the hand. They might have fallen from the paths of rectitude, instead of which many of them have been brought up for trades and made useful members of society. That Institution was commenced about twenty years ago, and has carried on its work in a quiet and unostentatious manner—I might almost say in too unobtrusive a manner. I am glad to know that its members have increased year by year, and I believe that the good effect in the Manchester district has increased in proportion to its numbers. I believe I am right in saying at the present time there is not a single deaf and dumb mute in the several manufacturing towns embraced in the Manchester district but who is brought under the supervision of this excellent Institution. Some time ago Mr Downing was ordained, by the Bishop of Manchester, chaplain to that Institution, and under his direction and guidance, religious services are held in the Institution for the benefit of these deaf and dumb mutes who meet there periodically. Without this special provision they would of necessity have been deprived of the means of grace which is provided for them. And the Institution has been carried on with so much success that I should like to see one established wherever we have large numbers of the population in our midst. It is a work of humanity, a work of philanthropy, and in the name of humanity and philanthropy, it claims the sympathy of all those who have regard for the spiritual well-being of their less favoured fellow-men. I am glad to take the opportunity of being here to bear testimony to the excellent work which has been accomplished in the northern towns, and the good results that have followed the labours of Mr Downing.

Mr James Foulston, General Secretary and Superintendent of the Yorkshire Association in Aid of the Adult Deaf and Dumb.

Permit me, in the first place, to say that in Yorkshire from whence I came, there are, I believe, 2000 deaf and dumb persons; and the principal reason why I have been sent to this Congress, is to gather up as much information as I possibly can for the benefit of at least some of those afflicted people. And I think my visit will not be in vain.

There are two main centres in Yorkshire, for educating and continuing the education and religious improvement of the deaf and dumb. One, the Institution at Doncaster, the other, the Adult Association in Leeds—with its branches spread far and wide. One branch being sixty miles, and the nearest ten miles from the parent

society. But as both the Institution and the Association combined do not I think, exercise any educational influence over more than about 500, the sad fact remains, that nearly 1500 deaf and dumb persons are, at this moment, unprovided with suitable religious instruction. If time had been allowed, I would have entered somewhat into detail as to the work of those two societies—but the time being so limited, I will pass on to one or two circumstances which I trust will operate upon the deaf and dumb at a distance. I may just say, in passing, I fully admit the absolute need there is, that the deaf and dumb should have proper ministerial services adapted to their peculiar case. I am, however, strongly convinced that the deaf and dumb might do far more for themselves than they do. They ought to be encouraged to collect together their afflicted fellows, and to assist in doing Church-work. By these means, the work which in the end may be done, no human intellect can conceive. If rightly guided, I am satisfied that they might do a great deal more Church-work than is generally done by them. To illustrate my meaning. In Leeds, some thirty years ago, a few deaf and dumb young men collected together for mutual improvement, and a deaf and dumb man, living in another town, ascertaining this, came a distance of sixteen miles weekly, in order to assist them in forming a society, and to conduct its infant operations. The consequence was this, his labours became effective. The spirit of self-help spread from one deaf and dumb man to another, and their united efforts greatly aided in the formation of an Association, which, after passing through a multitude of trying vicissitudes, has at length, in conjunction with the Leeds Institute for the Blind, culminated in the noble edifice gradually developing itself in that town for the blind and the deaf and dumb, and which will probably be opened in about eight months. It will supply a workshop for perhaps forty blind people, and afford ample accommodation for the religious services of the deaf and dumb, and I daresay for the blind also. Towards its erection, I believe, £10,000 have already been contributed, but by the time it is completed, very likely it will have cost £15,000. From this you will see, putting aside for the moment the reverend gentleman, the venerable founder, and who was in this room this afternoon, what has been done by the efforts, in great measure, of the deaf and dumb themselves. With regard to that poor creature of whose self-denying exertions I spoke of just now, in going a distance of sixteen miles, Sunday by Sunday, to do his best to instruct the few assembled deaf-mutes, I have a painful story to tell. Acting as the servant of the Association, I took him seven miles in a cab to a place where he would receive every comfort and care possible. His condition was most deplorable—for to his other deprivations were superadded the loss of sight and reason. Hence, he was deaf, dumb, blind, and insane. Can we picture to ourselves a more deplorable instance of human affliction? He had helped the Association in its early stage—and now it helps him. So that what he did for the society in its infancy, it repays him again—for it now comes to take charge of him in his helpless imbecility. He nursed it in its feebleness, it nursed him in his second childhood. He fostered it when he had the power, it tenderly took charge of him when he had not the power to take care of himself. What an instructive lesson to the deaf and dumb! Encourage them to work for themselves. Encourage them to help each other for good; and that is one kind of Church work that I should like to see them more engaged in, and much more done by them, and for their own sake chiefly.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, 6th OCTOBER.

The Right Reverend the President took the Chair at Seven o'clock.

THE POPULAR ARGUMENTS OF UNBELIEF, AND HOW TO MEET THEM.

PAPERS.

The Rev. V. H. Stanton, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The subject for our discussion this evening embraces two great divisions. There is the unbelief, and still more the uncertainty and perplexity, which in the most recent years have become not uncommon among even ordinary members of the upper and middle classes,—the result, chiefly, of the influence of some popular men of science and some of our leading reviews. And then, again, there is of older standing the unbelief which is to be found among our working-classes. In dealing with the former—the unbelief and doubt among the upper and middle classes—we have no difficulty in correctly apprehending the objections and perplexities to be met. They are such as are felt by persons with similar education, and similar social and political connections to our own ; nay, they are very probably such as have at some time or other weighed on our own spirits. The question of dealing with them popularly resolves itself into the question, in what measure and in what form the really scientific arguments on the Christian side can best be put, so as to be suited to people of ordinary education and intelligence. The battle between faith and scepticism will, indeed, have to be fought out to its final issue by scholars and philosophers. But, meanwhile, since unbelievers now-a-days bring forward their views on every platform, and in every journal, it becomes our duty to do what we can to help the doubting, and to protect the defenceless among our people ; and in doing so, we have to present evidences with a practical regard to what ordinary people are capable of comprehending and testing, and what ought chiefly to weigh with them in the determination of their belief.

On the other hand, unbelief among the working-classes is intimately bound up with their special circumstances and history ; and it requires some effort on the part of those born and bred in another class really to understand it. Most of the difficulties felt by doubters and unbelievers of both classes, are, indeed, the same in kind, and the answers to be given also the same ; but yet the proportion and relative importance of parts are different. And, as I believe it would be impossible to treat both at all effectively in the brief space of one paper, I am compelled to make a choice, and, for some special reasons, I shall take unbelief among the working-classes for my topic. Considered simply with regard to the danger of the spread of unbelief, the other division of the subject is quite as, if not more, important ; for I think the fears entertained by Mr Greg

and some others, with regard to the working-classes, are entirely unfounded and do them great injustice. But, on the other hand, the subject of unbelief among them has an interest and importance of its own, from being connected with the general question of the influence of the Church upon working-men. We shall all, I think, sadly admit that in laying any hold of the thoughts and the affections of the intelligent artisans, is where we have failed most utterly. It is consequently one of the subjects which most demands our attention. Now, unbelief is at least so far common among workmen, that any one who specially addresses himself to the task of influencing them, must be prepared to meet it. And further, what is perhaps still more important, unbelief studied in the special form in which it is found among them, as in part an outcome of their peculiar circumstances, cannot fail to throw light upon their general condition as a class.

My endeavour then in this paper will be, seizing upon what appear to me to be the most general and important features, briefly to describe working-class scepticism, and to throw out some hints as to the manner in which we should deal with it. Let us first turn our attention to the most positive side of their opinions; for it is a grave mistake to imagine that working-class atheism consists in mere negation. Indeed, I question whether any opinions which have ever been earnestly maintained by men, have been altogether unconnected with some positive creed, which has been really their inspiration. And however completely we may reply to the merely destructive arguments of opponents, until we have got at and dealt with the really positive ground of their opposition to us, we have done little to any good purpose. We have left the root untouched from which fresh shoots will continually be sprouting. The positive creed of working-class atheists is expressed in the word "Secularism." The programme which is put forward by their leaders, is the secularist programme. The societies formed in our large towns, of men holding these opinions, are called secularist societies. Secularism affirms that the only good worth seeking after is confined to this visible world and this life—such as we obtain by the right use of natural laws apprehended and studied through our senses, and it aims at securing the good, thus understood, of society. It is akin both to Utilitarianism and to Positivism; but it differs from the former as having the practical aim more prominent, and as being less merely an ethical theory; while it is at once more free from vagaries, and narrower and less noble than the latter. But, further, the working-man secularist does not merely regard theology and religion as barren things. He has got ingrained in him the notion that Christianity is an actual hindrance to all true progress,—a weight upon liberty, a degrading and cramping superstition, imposed upon the minds of men by priests,—(by which he understands, mind, Low-Churchmen and dissenting ministers quite as much as High-Churchmen or Romans). Herein consists one of the most striking and sad differences between sceptics among working-men and those of other classes. In the upper classes the sceptic is generally eager to acknowledge the moral beauty of Christianity; he shows that he is still drawn to it by tender memories; he is disposed still to claim the name of Christian on the ground of adherence to its ethical precepts. And as for his opinion of the clergy, he may think us stupid and timid, but he knows us too well, through ties of friendship and kindred, to impute to us malign power or intentions. But the working-man, and

here I speak of vast numbers of working-men who are not atheists, looks upon the clergy with all the prejudice of an alien class of whom he knows very little. What is still worse, he has seen or felt very little, if any, influence of Christianity itself in refining and elevating himself or the class to which he belongs. Nay, religion has often seemed to him, not (I think) altogether unreasonably, in the person of the clergy and of the staunchest defenders of the Church, to side with the opponents of the common good, as in the case of the great Corn Law agitation, which entered so deeply into the hearts of the people. And again, because the views of the clergy, and of his district-visitors, and of his allies the squire or large employer, about the proper way of doing good to the labouring-classes, run generally in the groove of what J. S. Mill calls the "patriarchal theory," Christianity, or at least its chief representative, the Church, has seemed naturally antagonistic to the workman's just aspirations after knowledge and independence.

And so the more fierce-spirited among them rejects the God, who seems to him the God of his foes in society. Nay, the very notion that there should be a God, who would, he thinks, be responsible for the misery there is in the world—misery of which he himself has such intimate knowledge—he brands as immoral. On the other hand, to win for himself and for his class, against an adverse society, and may be even an adverse nature, a few more of the things of this life, seems to him the one great end. Suffering—and seeing his neighbours suffer as he does, from all the fluctuations of trade, from the effects of wars, and of rash speculations, and of the greed of those already rich; requiring, as he does, constant effort to keep himself and his family above the pinch of actual want; shall we not acknowledge that his temptations to hold such views as I have described are great?

It is this positive aim, strengthened by the hatred of whatever seems to them to oppose it, which stimulates the crusade of the atheists against the prevailing beliefs. They attack natural theology, and sometimes show some skill in seizing upon ambiguities and imperfections in the best known expositions of it; as, for instance, Mr G. J. Holyoake * does; a man for whom, on account of his efforts in promoting Co-operative Societies and his honesty and ability, one cannot but feel sincere respect. But they find a still more powerful obstacle in the deep-rooted reverence of the English people for the Bible. And consequently their more active propagandists make the Bible their chief object of attack, assailing it not only with every argument, but with every jest, and every means of moving the emotions and passions, at their command. "You can only get the work done," says Mr Bradlaugh (he means the political and social work) "when we have knocked the Bible leaves off the eyes of the people." †

Now, though, as I have said, these objections are not the primary causes of their atheism, yet they undoubtedly need to be answered; and I will try to throw out briefly, by the way, a few hints about doing so. First, in taking up natural theology we must be careful not to press its arguments for more than they are worth; we must regard them only as raising in our minds a strong probability that there is a righteous Creator and Governor of the world and a future life, and as predisposing us to accept revelation, but not as, in themselves, giving complete satisfaction. Especially, before

* Especially in "The Last Trial of Theism."
† See "Secularism, Scepticism, and Atheism," p. 32.

we engage in controversy on the basis of natural theology, we must have made up our minds how we will deal with the theory of Dualism, with the problem of evil and the hypothesis that the power of God is limited.

But, next, as to the wider and more important controversy about revealed religion. The objections which I have found urged by atheist lecturers may be classed as follows. I will mention, *first*, That they fasten upon the immoral actions recorded of Abraham, Jacob, David, and others whom the Bible holds up as heroes and saints, exclaiming, 'These are the men whom the Bible honours.' But it is not difficult for us, on the other hand, to show that in these narratives we have exhibitions of God's truth and grace gaining the victory over individual sin, and gradually, but surely, raising human character and building up the Church. We can show also that of the men themselves they form a most unjust estimate. Carlyle's eloquent answer with respect to David covers other cases also:—

"David, the Hebrew king, had fallen into sins enough; blackest crimes;—there was no want of sins. And thereupon the unbelievers sneer and ask, Is this your man according to God's own heart? The sneer, I must say, seems to me but a shallow one. What are faults, what are the outward details of a life; if the inner secret of it be forgotten? David's life and history, as written for us in those psalms of his, I consider to be the truest emblem ever given of a man's moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest souls will ever discern in it the faithful struggle of an earnest human soul towards what is good and best. Struggle often baffled, sore baffled, down as into an entire wreck; yet a struggle never ended; ever with tears, repentance, true unconquerable purpose begun anew."

Secondly, They try to draw out self-contradictions in the doctrines and narratives of the Bible. Now, many of their alleged contradictions are extremely foolish and quibbling and unreasonable. But they have some justification, and at least they have a footing for such objections, in the view of the Bible which we have suffered to be far too common. Instead of the substance, the broad meaning, of passages being taken, and different parts being regarded as completing one another, the Bible has been treated as if every verse of every chapter could by itself be made oracular, as if every phrase, in itself alone, contained complete, absolutely expressed truth. So much has this verbal view prevailed, that the atheist lecturers even seem to find the ambiguities of various readings and the imperfections of the authorised English version, telling difficulties to raise about the Bible in popular audiences. All such objections vanish, when we hold sound principles of interpretation of Scripture; and in opposition to them we may draw attention to the marks of genuineness and simple truthfulness in the writers.

Thirdly, There are the objections based on contradictions between the Bible and science. This is in some respects a more serious class than the last, for that had merely to do with principles of interpretation. Yet let us frankly admit that the Bible was not intended to reveal science; and let us consistently proceed to acknowledge—many people who say that it was not intended to reveal science are not consistent with their principles—let us then, I say, proceed consistently to acknowledge that if it was not intended to reveal science, the writers unavoidably employed the language and ideas about the physical world of the time when they wrote; and then

these objections also are powerless, while the real value of the Bible in conveying to us God's *moral and spiritual* revelation is not one whit affected. But if, on the other hand, we do not take this position with regard to the independence of science and the Bible, our people must necessarily feel their whole faith jeopardised by the progressive discoveries of science, not only if they actually are, but from the mere possibility that they may turn out to be contrary to Scripture. I have here alluded to such difficulties as those raised by geology and by the doctrine of the origin of species. The possibility of miracles is an altogether different matter, and must necessarily be conceded before it can be worth while to discuss the credibility of the Scripture revelation in any sense.

Lastly, There are the attacks upon the external evidence for the writings; it being alleged that the authorship—especially, as most important, of the four Gospels—is shrouded in obscurity, and that the writings themselves are therefore untrustworthy; for these objections also, though in somewhat meagre form, are brought forward by working-class atheists. Now we believe that the authenticity of the Gospels can be most satisfactorily established; but the arguments are not such as can be properly dealt with before popular audiences. Learning and scholarship are needed to weigh them. But meanwhile there is something else which can be far more readily proved, which can scarcely indeed be disputed; namely, the fact that the Christian creed, in all its great historical and dogmatic outlines, was enshrined in a living Church of Christ during the first two centuries, and borne witness to by the lives and deaths of its members. And important and interesting as is the question of the authenticity of the sacred writings, we can afford to waive for the moment our position with regard to them. We have only to press the consequences of the fact of the existence from the first of the living Church, and we shall have ground enough, and more than enough, whereon to build our faith and our life.

But now to return to that which I said was the root. If we would effectually stop atheism among working-men—and a still wider and nobler problem—if we would make them as a class really Christian, we must prove to them, both by word and deed, that Christianity and not Secularism is that which is fitted to bless and redeem both the individual and society. We have to give them a worthier and truer conception of what Christianity is; especially, in order to meet their secularism, we have to show them that Christ is indeed the Redeemer of the *body*, that Christianity does not contemn this world or this life, but seeks to elevate and transform them. This work of giving just and adequate conceptions of truth is often far more important in convincing unbelievers, than that of drawing out evidences. For often it is not to the truth itself, or at least not altogether to the pure truth, that they are opposed; but partly to some false notion of the truth for their acquiring which we also perhaps are in some measure responsible. Especially is this true in the case of the working-classes; and therefore the lecturer on Christian Evidences must often turn into the expounder of that truth which he is prepared to defend.

We say further that we have to contend with a deep-rooted prejudice against the political and social auspices under which religion generally comes, and especially against our own clerical order. This can only be removed by favourable personal intercourse. For this reason I have little faith in the efficacy of isolated lectures on Christian Evidences by different

men, which is the plan now, I believe, most common. I think that a course by the same man throughout would be far preferable; so that the hearers might get to know him. And if such a lecturer also displayed conspicuous fairness, calmness, and sympathy, his influence for good might be great. In connection with the Cambridge lectures in populous places, when courses are given to working-men which often bear on burning social questions, I have seen suspicion and class-prejudice gradually give place to cordial good-will, as they get to know their lecturers and see that they are impartial and honest; and, I believe, the same might hold in the case of courses by fit men on Evidences. Everything, however, depends on the temper shown. Hear what Mr Holyoake says about the one book on the side of Theism which has produced a powerful impression on him,—Professor Newman "On the Soul." They are words which deserve to be graven in the memory of every controversialist for the truth. "It is a book," he says, "conceived in the highest genius of proselytism." And how so? That, Mr Holyoake proceeds, "which strikes me as the quality of its proselytising power is its ABSOLUTE CANDOUR."

Of this I am convinced, if working-men, whether secularists or not, find us as they get to know us to be manly, able to comprehend their point of view, just to whatever element of right there may be in it, and evidently desirous to render them such brotherly help as it will not be derogatory to their manhood to receive, they will accord us a respect, and manifest toward us a good-will not to be equalled by any other class.

I have dwelt on those causes of atheism among working-men which are most excusable. But I am well aware that there are other causes not at all so, such as imperfect sincerity, impatience, passion, want of a lofty moral ideal, blindness to spiritual things. Therefore we must make appeals to the conscience; in fact, our manner of treating the whole subject, must make all we say in effect, if not expressly such. Belief is ultimately the affair of the moral nature; only mediately is it that of the understanding. Those who have much to do with what are commonly called "Evidences," often seem to me in danger of forgetting this. But it is precisely because of this, because we cannot flinch from holding that unbelief is sin, that I have dwelt so much on those causes of atheism, in which we ourselves are partly to blame. The sceptic is not unjustly offended if we seem to brand him as *specially* reprobate on account of his opinions. But the impression upon him should be quite different, if we plainly and simply show, that though we do indeed hold him to be guilty, we are deeply conscious that because of our misrepresentations of the truth and our inconsistencies, we share in the guilt even of his unbelief, and that we also too often are guilty of practical unbelief in our own hearts.

The Venerable Archdeacon Reichel.

The subject is so vast, and the time allowed for dealing with it is so short, that no apology will be needed if I enter on it without further preface than the remark, that here we have to learn as well as teach, many of the arguments of modern unbelief being hurled not against Christianity in

itself, but against the conceptions of Christianity handed down from mediæval theology.

The main objections may be divided into three branches—theoretical, critical, and exegetical; those based on certain theories of existence; those based on a criticism which is supposed to be destructive of the authenticity or credibility of the books of Scripture; and those based on interpretations of Scripture which are supposed to be inconsistent with right reason. I must confine myself to the first of these; and even with this limitation, I can give but the faintest outline of the argument, the barest sketch of the method to be pursued.

Under the head of theoretical and *à priori* objections must be classed all arguments against Christianity, or, indeed, any possible revelation, based on the evolution and development hypotheses.

These theories, which have of late become extremely fashionable, and are probably being extensively (though secretly) diffused, especially in the medical profession, are welcomed really because they are supposed to do away with the necessity of successive distinct creative acts, if not with the necessity of any creation whatsoever. To this last extreme they have not been carried by their chief advocate, Mr Darwin; but certainly many of his disciples do not shrink from it. In any case, original creation is pushed so far back that it may conveniently be forgotten, and this, coupled with the assertion (made by the positivist philosophy), that we have no business with anything beyond phenomena, leads, if not to atheism, or the downright denial of a God, at least to agnosticism, which is much the same thing under another name. For if we can know nothing whatever about God, it matters little whether we deny His existence or not. These theories interfere not with religion only. By ascribing everything in the universe, including the phenomena of life, to gradual progression and strictly mechanical development, they really overthrow morality, for there can be no morality where there is no self-determination, and there can be no self-determination where all is mechanism. It is useless to fume against this conclusion as Professor Huxley does, for so long as the mind of man is capable of reasoning, men must and will draw the consequences that logically arise from the premisses, and this necessary consequence of the development and evolution theory in its full-blown shape, is, therefore, a most powerful argument against it. For we have a perfect right to reason back from the absurdity of a conclusion to the absurdity of the premisses which necessarily lead to that conclusion; and the conclusion, in this case, is opposed to common sense, and if it could be acted on, would make society impossible.

(This argument against that branch of the evolution and development theory, which is now called Automatism, has been most ably pursued by Lord Blachford, in a late number of the *Contemporary Review*.)

But these atheistic theories may be met not only by the argument from their inevitable consequences, powerful as that is, but by a directly scientific method, which strikes at the premisses themselves.

It is remarkable that while mere physiological inquiries and metaphysics (like those of Bain) based entirely on physiology, have built up a system of practical atheism, the higher physico-mathematical discoveries of the last thirty years have made atheism logically impossible. "The science of force or energy leads us to the belief, or rather to the *demonstration*,

of an absolute origin or creation of things. It was an idea of the ancient Stoics, and survived into modern times, that all changes in the universe move as it were in closed curves, in which everything comes round again to what it was at first; so that the universe may have existed from an eternal past, and may continue to exist without substantial change through an eternal future. But the modern science of energy has disproved this, by showing that actions are constantly going on which cannot be reversed. Heat is constantly diffusing itself, and when it is diffused, there is no power in nature which can concentrate it back again. This causes a destruction of motive power, because heat, when equally diffused, is incapable of being transformed into motive power; to use a familiar illustration, a steam-engine could do no work if the condenser were as hot as the boiler. Thus, by reason of the irreversible process of the diffusion of heat, the stock of motive power in the universe is constantly diminishing, and all things are tending to immobility. If we had the means of ascertaining how much motive power in the universe has been destroyed (and though we cannot hope to ascertain these data for the entire universe, we know them in some degree of approximation for the solar system),—if we knew these data, it would probably be within the power of mathematical science to ascertain approximately the date at which destruction of motive power began, and this would be identical with the date of the absolute beginning of the existing order of nature. To quote Clerk Maxwell's address to the British Association in 1870: 'We thus arrive at the conception of a state of things which cannot be conceived as the physical result of a previous state of things, and we find that this condition actually existed, not in the utmost depths of a past eternity, but separated from the present time by a finite interval. This idea of a *beginning* is one which the physical researches of recent times have brought home to us more than any observer of the course of scientific thought in former times would have had reason to expect.'" *

In other words, the universe is now *demonstrated* to be a machine, exactly like a clock or watch in this respect, that it has been wound up, or set agoing, at some definite time in the past, and will in some definite time run down. Whatever the time may be, eight days, eight years, eight million, eight billion of years, the principle is the same. Now such a machine cannot set itself agoing. The clock or watch cannot wind itself up; that must be done for it from without. Hence a winder up of the great clock of the universe, a creator in other words of its motion (by storing up the energy which causes it, and which, though not lost, is gradually being transformed, and becoming useless for motive purposes,) such a creator is simply a logical necessity. The conclusion is inevitable, and those who wish to escape it can only do so by playing fast and loose with reason. They reason so long as reasoning suits their purpose, and when it ceases to suit their purpose, they abjure it.

But further:—it is well-known that the Atomic Theory (to which so much attention was called last year in a notorious address) was adopted in its original form by Epicurus, chiefly for the purpose of getting rid of any Being possessed of creative and directive power and will: in short, to justify atheism. "But, by a strange irony, it is now evident that of all

* Presidential Address to the Belfast Philosophical Society, by Joseph John Murphy, Esq. Nov. 4, 1874.

physical theories the Atomic Theory is that which leads most irresistibly and directly to the acknowledgment of a Divine Power and Intelligence. . . . To quote again from Professor Clark Maxwell :—

'In the heavens we discover, by their light, and by their light alone, stars so distant from each other that no material thing can ever have passed from one to another ; and yet this light, which is to us the sole evidence of these distant worlds, tells us also that each of them is built up of molecules of the same kind as those we find on earth. A molecule of hydrogen, *e.g.*, whether in Sirius or Arcturus, executes its vibrations in precisely the same time. Each molecule, therefore, throughout the universe, bears impressed on it the stamp of a metric system as distinctly as does the metre of the archives at Paris. No theory of evolution can be formed to account for the similarity of molecules, for evolution necessarily implies continuous change, and the molecule is incapable of growth or decay, of generation or destruction. None of the processes of nature, since the time when nature began, have produced the slightest difference in the properties of any molecule. We are therefore unable to ascribe either the existence of the molecules or any of their properties to the operation of any of the causes which we call natural. On the other hand, the exact equality of each molecule to all others of the same kind, gives it, as Sir John Herschell has well said, the essential character of a manufactured article, and precludes the idea of its being eternal and self-existent. Thus we have been led along a strictly scientific path, very near to the point at which science must stop. In tracing back the history of matter, science is arrested when she assures herself, on the one hand, that the molecule has been made, and on the other, that it has not been made by any of the processes which we call natural. Science is incompetent to reason on the creation of matter itself out of nothing. We have reached the utmost limit of our thinking faculties when we have admitted that because matter cannot be eternal and self-existent, it must have been created.' " *

Thus are we led, by considerations purely physical, to the very conclusion which is stated in the first verse of Genesis : " In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Here, as in many other cases, Scripture is more and more completely borne out by recent discovery.

We are then *forced* to believe that a God exists with, at least, the attributes of omnipotence (in the true sense of the word, in which it means the being able to do everything except what is self-contradictory, and therefore self-destructive,—an important qualification) and of omniscience : since He who originated not only the *motion* of the machine, but the very *materials* of it, and therefore, of necessity, also its *construction*, must be all-powerful and all-knowing in respect of that which owes to Him its existence.

You will have perhaps remarked that so far I have said nothing about the argument from *Design*. By itself, that argument has been plausibly, though I think not successfully evaded. But when coupled with the argument I have now sketched : the confluence and concurrence of the purely physico-mathematical demonstration of a *Creator* with the teleological proof of a *Designer*, becomes simply irresistible. Science as well as Scripture bursts out into the ejaculation " O Lord, how manifold are Thy works ! *In wisdom* hast Thou made them all."

* See the before quoted Presidential Address.

But here comes in a stupendous difficulty : a difficulty not to be evaded, not to be explained. I mean the existence of evil.

We must always remember that our *knowledge* of evil from observation is confined to this globe—a very small part of the universe indeed. But this globe, at least, is full of pain and death ; nay more, pain and death do not appear to be an after-thought. They enter into the very contrivance of life. Death is necessary to such life as we have any experience of. Whatever has life preys on other life, animal or vegetable : and that with an adjunct of suffering which continually increases the higher we rise in the scale of being.

What is the inference from this ? That the Creator is malevolent ? But that shocks every instinct of our nature. And how on that supposition, should He have constructed us to venerate goodness above all other qualities ? Are we on a higher level than Himself, and that in reference to the highest of all attributes ? That would be inconceivable.

Or is His power limited ? But how can that be, seeing He has made everything ?

Or are there two Creators ? One or other of these solutions of the difficulty, seems to have tempted J. S. Mill.* Revolting in his later years from the atheism in which he had been brought up ; becoming impatient, too, of the agnosticism which is but a cowardly name for atheism, he seems to think that there must be a God, but that He cannot be omnipotent and omniscient, without being malevolent, which he shrinks from asserting, and therefore he hints at Dualism. He does not appear to have thought that an omniscient Creator might know beforehand what His creature, left free to determine for himself, would do : that there can be no virtue without trial, no trial without the possibility of fall : that therefore creation may have been from the first adapted to the surely-foreseen result. No doubt this is but a tentative, approximate, and imperfect solution of the difficulty : but it is at any rate preferable to one which violates all one's instincts, and indeed sets reasoning at defiance. It is easy, too, to overcharge the picture, as Mill has done : to represent the universe, or rather this infinitesimal portion of the universe, as a huge torture-chamber, by carefully excluding from consideration all the multiform appliances for relief and enjoyment, all the limitations of suffering, all its higher results, in so many instances, of happiness. But such a picture does not resemble nature. Nature leaves on the reflecting mind, not the impress of limited power or wisdom, still less the frightful impress of malevolence : those who have suffered most deeply will be the first to repudiate this : it rather leaves the impress of some mystery behind the scenes ; of something perhaps for ever inexplicable, but which must never be allowed to interfere with the primary and instinctive conviction that God is good : something like those strange algebraic functions which, in themselves unintelligible, do nevertheless come right in the end, and disappear when the problem is worked out. Only, to carry out the metaphor, do not let us fancy that they never will disappear in the working ; in other words, do not let us fancy that evil will be eternal, and make that fancy a part of our religion. Scripture has no word for pure, abstract, metaphysical eternity, and probably more unbelief has arisen from forgetting this, than from any other single source.

* See his Posthumous Essays.

To pursue the argument. We see, then, that evolution and development must have had a beginning. They need not therefore tyrannise our thoughts. Creation was a miracle in being the origin of development and law. May not that which has begun be interrupted during its course as well as by its necessary end? Must creative power be necessarily *suspended* during the course of that which it has created? One miracle being granted, is not miracle in general conceivable? Even Mr M. Arnold, though he does not believe in miracles, except those of his own doing, is too modest to attempt proving their impossibility.*

And having brought the argument to this point, it may be well to notice that the denial of miracles supposed to be involved in the development hypothesis, is not agreed on by its authors. Darwin believes that man developed out of some lower animal by natural selection and so forth. Wallace, who contemporaneously with Darwin thought out the development theory, denies this. According to him, man is a break in the chain. In other words, man is a distinct creation, and therefore a miracle. But if the first Adam was a miracle, may not the second Adam (to use St Paul's language) be one likewise? At any rate, are we to give up our historic faith in deference to an hypothesis on the cardinal point of which its very originators cannot agree?

I have not mentioned the important fact that by a whole set of physiologists life is deemed incapable of self-evolution from inorganic matter. If so, we have two breaks: first, the introduction of life, and secondly, the introduction of human life—each break a miracle. Shall we then on mere *à priori* grounds refuse to accept a third break—the introduction of divine life?

And here at length come in the reasons for miracle and for Christianity suggested by its very existence. The argument is briefly this:—

Christianity is the promise of actual physical life in the future, guaranteed and exemplified by the fact of Christ's physical resurrection from the dead. For that Christ's resurrection was to the apostles and their converts a physical fact, and not a mere moral change, which, indeed, in the case of Christ Himself would be impertinent, is, with all deference to the superior intelligence of Mr M. Arnold, as certain as that a battle was fought at Actium. If all the Gospels, nay, the whole New Testament, except those four letters of St Paul which the wildest German criticism has never even tried to assail, were suddenly expunged, we should know thus much. Criticism is disabled here. How then did this get to be believed, especially, as when Jesus came, the age of miracles was passed? Infidels carefully keep this out of sight: they would have us suppose that in those days miracles, or what passed for miracles, were as plenty as blackberries. But this was not so. The age of miracles, I repeat, was just as much passed then as it is passed now. Since Daniel's time, 500 years before Christ, no Jew believed any real miracle to have taken place: "We see no more signs," was the half-despairing general cry. Nor were miracles at all necessary to accredit a messenger sent from God. No miracle was ever ascribed to John the Baptist; the Talmud which recognises Christ's miracles is silent about his: and hundreds of years afterwards, Mohammed, dealing with a like Semitic race, never attempted a miracle: both he and John the Baptist succeeded very well without

* See his last paper in *The Contemporary Review.*

miracles. Miracles, then, were not *necessary* to Christ's success. How then came it to pass, it may well be asked, that the life of Jesus, crowded with *unnecessary* miracles, crowned with the one vital miracle of His resurrection, came to be believed so widely, and attained just by virtue of that one miracle such gigantic influence? I will venture to say, that had our Lord's miracles not been real, they would have been then as they are now, the *difficulties* of Christianity rather than its supports.

But further, and strongest of all: Whence did Christianity, or the belief in a risen Saviour, go forth? What was the seat of the first organised Christian community? Galilee? where Jesus had chiefly lived, and where He was much loved, and to which all His apostles, except one, belonged? So Julian the Apostate would fain have had men suppose: for he always gave Christians the nickname of "Galileans." He perceived how much it would countenance his theory if he could make out that Galilee, the abode of ignorant peasants, not Jerusalem, the abode of the aristocracy, of the priesthood, of the law, of the government, was the seat of the first and Mother Church. But this, as you all know, was not the case. No fact in history is more certain than this, that not Galilee, the scene of Christ's life and activity and popularity, but Jerusalem, the scene of His death, was the first place where Christianity formulated itself and began its march of triumph. The very place where the Teacher had been execrated and crucified and buried; where the authorities had all the power and all the will to crush the fable of His resurrection, and might at once have crushed it by producing His dead body if He had not risen,—this metropolis of Judaic bigotry and sacerdotal pride, on which the Teacher could never make any durable impression during His life, *this*, of all others, was the birthplace of the new cosmopolitan religion, which destroyed the sacerdotal caste, broke down the partition wall between Jew and Gentile, and declared all men equal in the sight of God!

Finally, To close this portion of the argument, it is instructive to notice the nature of the evidences for Christianity, as contrasted with the nature of the attacks on Christianity. These last go on the principle of finding out some weak place, some flaw; and having found it, they concentrate attention on it, refusing to take a broad view, *declining to be accountable for difficulties.* Against this destructive method few systems would be proof. In law, in politics, in morals, it would be equally effective. Yet men refuse to give heed to it in such matters. Or, unbelievers quietly assume what they are beginning to confess they cannot prove—the impossibility of miracles: and this being assumed, they deny the truth of historic Christianity. Of unhistoric Christianity, which some of them would generously spare, we may well make them a present: the conceits of Mr M. Arnold or M. Ernest Renan would give small comfort for which to barter away the promise of eternal life. The evidences *for* religion, on the other hand, are multiform and convergent; and this is at once their strength and their weakness: their strength, from their number and agreement: their weakness, because it makes them so difficult to embrace in one comprehensive glance. *Science*, in its highest department and latest discoveries, demonstrating the being of a God; *history*, which exhibits the unique phenomenon of a religion originating in the blaze of the most sceptical civilisation the world has ever seen, and making its way without the least appeal to force, to popular prejudice, to intellectual pride, to love of power, by the bare proclamation of what to

the Jews was an offence, and to the Greeks was folly; *searching and scholarly criticism*, rebutting the wild theories which spring up in Germany like mushrooms, from the ever-fresh necessity of saying something new: * the *moral* sense, which, while it makes automatism absurd, at the same time does not enable us to act as it tells us we ought to act; and therefore irresistibly postulates some remedy if we, the highest of human creatures, are not to be at the same time the most faulty and the most wretched; nay, the very discordance of the attacks on Christianity with which the press now teems,—all surely lead up to the same conclusion, the truth of that singular religion which alone falls in with our most cultivated conscience, supplies our most real wants, satisfies our loftiest and otherwise despairing aspirations, and which resembles its Founder in this as in other things, that while so many bear witness against it, no two of them agree together in their witness.

Mr R. H. Hutton.

In a Church Congress held in this borough, it is not easy to discuss the question, How to deal with the popular arguments advanced by Unbelief, without asking ourselves, How much popular convictions as to questions of evidence, whether advanced by Belief or Unbelief, are worth? And the question is a vital one. For if popular arguments, or, to use a somewhat larger word, popular reasons, whether for belief or unbelief, as to any point involving the proper weight to be attached to moral evidence, are apt to be wholly inadequate to justify the so-called convictions for which they are advanced, how can we value the popular faith in Christianity, even if we succeed in producing it? Is it not just as likely to be produced by wholly illegitimate as by legitimate considerations? You hear men asking how can we lay any stress on the opinion of large masses of people on questions of moral evidence, when we see a large part of a great constituency sincerely carried away by its enthusiasm for a cause which hardly a man of any head, who has studied and pondered it with the slightest impartiality, believes to be in any single point,—intellectual or moral,—a respectable, or even a plausible cause? There is no remark which I have heard made on the Tichborne case which struck me so much as this,—that it ought to teach us how little true "evidences" weigh in moulding the belief of large masses of people. The masses attach, it is observed, a fictitious importance to one or two kinds of evidence, and no importance at all to a whole host of others which it is far more completely beyond the reach of either conscious or unconscious deception to invent or modify, than it is to invent or modifiy the evidences which carry the multitude. I have heard it said that whether the "evidences" of Christianity be good, bad, or indifferent, it is, at all events, clear that the people at large are incompetent to judge of them. The people are pretty certain, it is alleged, to believe or reject Christianity, if they do believe or reject it, for reasons which are not good, and not for reasons which are. So that even if, by accident, they believe in a true faith, such popular movements as we have lately had, prove clearly that a sound judgment on *evidence* has nothing to do with the matter; indeed, that the multitude are

* See Professor Lightfoot's Answer to "Supernatural Religion."

quite incapable of measuring the good evidence against the bad, or of fixing their attention on those considerations which chiefly determine judicial minds in the decision they adopt on the issue before them.

Now, to some extent I agree with this view, and fancy every thinking man must more or less agree with it,—to this extent, namely, that a good many people who believe in Christ may perhaps have no other reason so good for believing in Him as the purely practical one, that they find His words and acts the highest possible guides for their own lives. Yet we can hardly deny that any such belief as this, if it be belief in the divine nature of Christ at all, far overlaps the grounds on which it is founded, and implies no power at all of meeting the reasons which are generally tendered in justification of unbelief. It is not, I think, at all a worthless kind of belief, but it is a belief which is quite worthless for the purposes of speculative controversy. Unbelievers may fairly say that even they possibly might themselves accept this much of practical belief in Christ, and that even if they did it, it need not alter their opinion as to the preponderance of evidence against our Lord's supernatural claims. They might accept Him as much the greatest of human spiritual guides, and yet hold Him in error as to what He claimed to be, namely, a more than human guide, indeed the Truth itself, no less than the Way and the Life.

But is there nothing more that we can claim for the popular and uncritical belief in Christ, except only this, that it testifies to a real coincidence between the authority of conscience and the authority of our Lord's words and acts,—a coincidence which, of course, is also discovered in a less or greater degree between the words or acts of other men and the same inner voice? Is there no element in a good deal of the popular belief in Christ which really touches the *speculative* issue between faith and unbelief? I cannot help thinking that there is, and that the apologists for Christianity have of late years dwelt far too much on those more learned, critical, and judicial siftings of evidence which do not and could not in reality influence, even unconsciously, the popular belief at all (though they are quite to the point when scholars discuss the question with scholars), to the exclusion of considerations which more or less sway the minds of almost all of us, and this, too, often much more legitimately than evidences of the more refined and learned kind, the exact importance of which it is very difficult to estimate rightly, though its tendency may be obvious enough. I think the few minutes I have cannot be better used than in an attempt to recall those, perhaps, older-fashioned considerations which have, more or less consciously, and quite rightly, influenced the convictions of a great multitude of Christians as to the claims of Christ, but which do not require for their appreciation any of that judicial sagacity in sifting evidence for want of which the masses so often make ridiculous blunders.

1. The first point on which I think it is hardly possible to lay too much stress, is the ample and even redundant testimony which meets us in all parts of the Gospel to the early and deliberately announced intention of Christ to found an enduring kingdom, on materials which were not only not of the stuff of which earthly Governments are made, but the Moulder of which did not contemplate, indeed, steadily refused to contemplate, conquering within any assigned period the help-

of earthly Governments for His purpose, or making any alliance of that kind an essential condition of the kingdom which He proclaimed. The Jewish polity was a spiritual polity, but it rested on an organisation which wielded all the recognised powers of the State. Christ rejected the idea of directly availing Himself of these means, and declared His purpose to use means so unpromising that, in the human sense, they were hardly means to such an end at all. I never hear without the thrill of a new surprise that calm, strange, and unique prophecy, addressed at the very outset of His short career to a dozen peasants, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," when I remember that a kingdom has really been given to them, though not a kingdom of this world. "Follow me," He said to one or two couples of fishermen, as they cast their nets into the waters, and mended them on the shores of the Lake of Galilee, "and I will make you fishers of men." And they *were* made fishers of men, and obviously made so solely by Him who thus chose them from a calling apparently so little qualified to fit them for the hopeless task. It is remarkable enough that by far the greatest of the Apostles,—he in whom even high human insight might have discerned the elements of marvellous force and moral influence,—was not chosen for his work during Christ's earthly life. The "little flock" to whom our Lord announces so early and so peremptorily that they are "not to fear," because it is their "Father's good pleasure to give them the kingdom," are such a "little flock" as no one before ever proposed to make the founders of a new world. Indeed, Christ asserts repeatedly that they are chosen because they are *not* "wise and prudent," because "they are babes," and no doubt because on that very account they are not likely to aim at the construction of an ambitious polity; because they have no sort of influence which would give them authority even in the little world of Judæa. They are anxiously warned against any sort of striving to acquire earthly dignity. Wealth is even forbidden them. They are promised "the kingdom" in the same breath in which they are told to sell what they have, and provide for themselves bags which wax not old, "a treasure in the heavens which faileth not," in order that "where their treasure is, there may their hearts be also." Moreover, while the Apostles are forbidden all the ordinary means of binding together a great earthly organisation, they are told that they are to be for a long time few and scattered, sowers of division, preachers to people who could not or would not understand. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few." The kingdom is not to be a popular one, in that time at least. Their Master speaks to the multitude in parables, because to the few chosen it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to the many it is not given. Yet the chosen Apostles themselves misunderstand and misinterpret their Master. Peter, after being told that his confession is the rock on which the Church should be built, is spoken of as a tempter and an offence to his Master, as one who savours not of the things which are of God, but those which are of men. John is twice rebuked, once for his revengeful spirit, once for his short-sighted ambition. Judas's treachery is predicted. All the twelve are warned that they will fail at the hour of Christ's trial. In a word, from beginning to end of the Gospels we have evidence which no one could have managed to forget

that Christ deliberately chose materials of which it would have been impossible for any one to build a great organisation, unless he could otherwise provide, and continue to provide, the power by which that organisation was to stand. Who can hear the words, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes," without being consciously or unconsciously impressed with the divine confidence of the purpose which selected what we should have thought the least promising of all materials for the most majestic and enduring of works, and proved their fitness by the history of the ages? Now, the popular belief in Christianity has, I think, much more to do with the vivid impression made by these reiterated and emphatic assertions, ingrained into the very essence of the Gospel, of our Lord's intention to establish a kingdom out of elements thus humanly hopeless,—and of His clear knowledge that they *were* in every human sense hopeless,—than with any learned evidences. And for my part, I hold the grounds of this impression to be worth more, even though, or perhaps I ought to say, *because*, they are thus open to the gauging of popular feeling, than all the learned evidences put together. Would it not be something incredible that a mere man should profess his intention to establish a kingdom which shall endure for ever, by the help of a dozen ignorant men, who will not even keep him with them for more than a year or two, who habitually misunderstand his words and mistake his spirit, and who are told that they are destined almost involuntarily to drink of his cup and be baptized with his baptism, in spite of misreading the sort of destiny which that implies, and the kind of glory to which it leads,—and then that his mere prophetic guess should be so far fulfilled as the history of Christianity has fulfilled Christ's prediction at this day? Is there not here a vision of what would be to man an impossible future, on the partial realisation of which the popular mind is far better able to pass a trustworthy judgment, than is even the most judicial mind to pass judgment on the intricate details of biographic or historic evidence? Or consider only what is implied in the words of the Last Supper. Christ announces, what must then have been to the most judicial of human minds nothing but conjecture, that He was then and there to give up His life for the world. This could not have taken place without His condemnation by the Roman ruler, against whose rule He had been guilty of no offence. At that time, it can scarcely have seemed even probable to a sober-minded Jew, that the anger of the Jewish priesthood should bring about such a result at all, much less immediately. But Christ takes it so absolutely for granted, that He speaks of the bread and wine as symbols of His broken body and poured-out blood, and founds upon the similitude a new testament, which He declares to be for the remission of the sins of many. And not only does His death at once follow as He predicts, but the bread and wine become in some sense or other His body and blood to future centuries:—

> "Both Faith and Art have given
> To that one hour, a life of endless rest,
> And still, whoe'er would taste the food of Heaven,
> May to that table come a welcome guest."

Words which, coming at such a time from the mouth of an ordinary man would have sounded like a melancholy conjecture and a tender metaphor,

prove to have been in Christ's mouth the solid foundation of history and the corner-stone of a lasting faith. Now, surely the popular impression of these facts as implying that our Lord's knowledge had its roots planted in the very well-springs of the world's history, is, to say the least, infinitely better justified by reason, than any inference, however judicial, from the careful survey of minute historic evidences possibly would be. The materials of the building are not only intrinsically frail, but it is the Builder himself who selects them *because* they are so, and who yet calmly announces that the building shall outlast the Heavens. His own death is to be the signal of defection and despair to His followers, yet it is to be the firm foundation of an eternal structure; and, as a matter of fact, no sooner is His visible hand withdrawn than the living stones run from all quarters of the earth and pile themselves into the temple of the ages. Is there no real solidity in the conviction of divine power which these evidences produce?

2. The only other feature in the Gospels to which I can now call attention as calculated to impress the mind of the multitude, and yet as being even more worthy of credit than most kinds of judicial evidence, is perhaps merely another phase of that to which I have already referred, but it is distinct enough in its moral impressiveness to need separate treatment,—I mean the habitual stress laid by Christ on His own person as the organ of Christian influence. Nothing could be better calculated to strike the popular mind than this emphasis—emphasis, remember, laid by one who from the first preaches lowliness of heart, and predicts the shortness of His life and the ignominious violence of His end,—on Himself as the source of an enduring power, and the corner-stone of a divine kingdom. The necessity of loving Him, the perpetual fame of her who anointed Him for His burial, the grief that will be rightly felt for Him when He leaves the earth, the identification of men's duty to each other, even to "the least of these, my brethren," with their duty to Him, all these are assumptions which run through the whole Gospel quite as strikingly as does the clear knowledge of the frailty of the human materials Christ had chosen, and of the supernatural character of the power by which He intended to vivify those means. Though His kingdom is to be the kingdom of which a little child is the true type, the kingdom in which it is the "meek" who are blessed, in which it is the "poor in spirit" who are to be the rulers, yet this is only saying in other words that He is to be the life of it, since it is because He is "meek and lowly in heart" that those who come to Him shall find rest for their souls. Whether you choose to say that it is in spite of this humility, or because of this humility, yet in either case Christ proclaims Himself as the true object of love, and the permanent centre of power throughout the kingdom He proclaims. He declares that His departure will be the first legitimate cause of mourning to His followers:—"Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them; but the day will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." The love of Him is to predominate over all other love. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." Exclusion from His presence is everywhere treated as that outer darkness where there are weeping and gnashing of teeth. His vision of the spiritual future of untrue men is of men crying to Him, "Lord, Lord!" and entreating Him to recognise them, to whom He will

be compelled to reply, "I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." He justifies with warmth all honour paid to Him personally: "The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always." "Verily I say unto you, wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, which this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her." And now consider what usually comes of self-assertion much less astounding than this in a human being, and what actually came of it in our Lord's case. The greatest of the world's teachers make light of themselves; Socrates treats of his own death as of no moment. The Jewish prophets never think of treating their own careers as of any significance apart from the message they deliver. And as a rule in the world, when a man magnifies himself with gentleness and simplicity, we smile; we may find him lovable, but there is always a little laughter mingled with our love. When he does it arrogantly or imperiously, we are revolted. In either case, the first generation which does not personally know him puts aside his pretensions as irrelevant, if not even fatal to his greatness. But how was it with Christ? The first great follower who had never known Him in the flesh, St Paul, takes up this very note as the key-note of the new world. To him "to live is Christ, to die is gain." His heart is "hid with Christ in God." His cry is, "Not I, but Christ that worketh in me." He makes his whole religious philosophy turn on the teaching of our Lord that He is the Vine, and His disciples the branches. In the land of the olive St Paul adapts the image to the husbandry of the olive. Again, Christ is the head, and men the members. And what is true of St Paul is true of all those in whom the Christian faith has shown its highest genius in subsequent ages. These sayings of Christ as to being Himself the centre of human affections and the light of human lives, instead of repelling men, interpret their own highest experience, and seem but the voice of an interior Truth and the assurance of an imperishable joy.

And now what shall we say of the value of such verifications of Christ's strange foresight? If one comes and shows us certain poor instruments with which we all admit that we could have done nothing and could do nothing, and he tells us, "I will do much with them, and ever more and more, and infinitely more after I have disappeared from the earth than during the year or two in which I remain here; and though the secret of my power is humility and self-abnegation, the only sap of that humility is love for me, and the essence of that self-abnegation is life in me," and if the pledge given is actually redeemed, and redeemed apparently at all events, by the very means he had pointed out,—if the work he began goes on with infinitely more power after his death than before it, and the whole inspiration of that work turns out to be the personal relation to him which he had proclaimed,—is it irrational for the people to draw the natural inference that the best account to be given of what is happening is that which He gave who told us that it should happen,—namely, that it all springs from that hidden life in God which Christ led before He came here, while He was here, and after He was seen here no more? At least if this be not a rational explanation, is there one more rational? Shall we not admit that he who foretells a most improbable event is more likely to be informed of the secret principles determining that event, than those who disbelieve and discredit his language? And if *He* cannot tell us what these principles

are, how are we to trust those who, if they had been living when He was here, would have ridiculed His anticipations as false, and condemned His arrogance as impious? It cannot be doubted that the sceptics of to-day would, for the most part, have been much more sceptics when all that Christ promised was still in the future, and far the greatest and divinest of His works, the work of realising what He had foretold, was as yet hardly begun. It is, then, a popular blunder to repudiate the hypotheses of those who must on their own principles have discountenanced Christ's anticipations, if they had lived then, even more superciliously than they now explain away the issue? May we not say that the principles on which it would have been folly to believe what has actually happened, can hardly be so sound as those plain popular principles intelligible to all the world, however little gifted with judicial faculties, on which it would have been from the first impossible *not* to believe it?

I am quite aware that there is nothing new in these considerations. If anything original can now be said on these great matters, certainly it is not I who can say it. But in relation to the proof recently adduced of the worthlessness of popular judgments on questions of pure evidence, it seemed desirable to point out elements in our popular Christian impressions which will not only bear sifting, but seem all the more valuable when the sifting is done. I know that certainty of conviction on these subjects cannot be attained by mere human reasoning,—is impossible without divine agency. I know, too, how often the arrogance of human ignorance mistakes itself for submissiveness to a divine agency. Even in our highest religious convictions, we ought never to forget how easy it is for the poorest delusion to counterfeit certainty. But if true and reasonable faith be impossible to the people at large, it is, I am sure, impossible to the learned too. The foundations of faith do not exist at all, if they be not in the deepest sense within the reach of the people. And hence it seems most important to show that the principal approaches by which religious truth reaches the mind, are approaches as much wider and freer than those of nineteen centuries ago, as the craving multitudes of our own day are more numerous and in even deeper need of spiritual help than the multitudes who looked for a new redemption in Galilee, Judæa, and Rome.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. Robert Maguire, M.A., Rector of St Olave's, Southwark.

My Lord,—I know not what the reasons were that moved the promoters of this Congress to select my name as that which was to be associated with this topic. I have never once debated or disputed publicly with unbelievers on the matter of their unbelief. Nevertheless, I have not been without my measure of intercourse with the working classes, and in more phases of a religious character than that of this evening. We have already been reminded that the phrase "popular objections" is contra-distinguished from those that are called, or alleged to be, scientific, literary, or learned. I take it that it means the "rough and ready" objection and the "rough and ready" reply. And yet even this needs a caution; for the rough-and-ready objection is not always the way to put it; and the rough-and-ready answer is not always sufficiently adequate to be relied upon. I feel, however, that the "how to meet them" does

not mean mere controversy or altercation, but that, as clergymen in our parishes, we endeavour to meet the objections of our people for edification. To express a few principles of action in this respect is all that my limited time will just now permit. I have, for myself, always endeavoured to ascertain whether any, and what, common ground exists between myself and a doubting objection. There is almost always some such common ground existing, and this we are bound to occupy, and from it to elicit its development and growth. I do not mean any indolent surrender of any faith, but at some point of common ground to take our stand, and see how the small modicum of faith which a man possesses is capable of increase. I give you a case in point. It was on last Hospital Sunday twelve-months. I found myself engaged in an open-air service in my late parish; and the only point of common agreement I could count on as between myself and my audience was that hospitals were good and useful institutions for those who were overtaken by disease or accident. I sought out, however, other points of agreement; and I told a mixed multitude the story which I had read in the *Times* somewhere about Christmas of 1873, of the public funeral of Victor Hugo, the younger, in Paris. It was a Republican, yea, even a Communistic demonstration; Louis Blanc was the panegyrist of the occasion; and in pronouncing the funeral oration, he spoke for himself and fellows:—"They say we have no belief, but we have; for we believe in a God and in the immortality of the soul, but no priesthood." Well, "no priesthood;" perhaps not. As a Frenchman, he spoke of the French priesthood, and most likely with some truth. But what of his belief in God and the immortality of the soul? Belief in a God is a germ capable of a wide-spread growth as to God's knowledge and majesty, and power and love, and all He would be expected to do for His creatures. Belief in the immortality of the soul involves a future state. That dead man still lived somewhere, and though the body was in the dust, the soul still lived on. Then, if there is a future state, there will be the difference between the good and the evil there as here. And this involves a law, and a lawgiver to pronounce it, and a judge to execute it. See, then, how the tree has grown; yea, even though it were to be cut down to the very root, it will sprout again; "Resurgam" will be its motto. And if we were driven even to the principles of natural religion, we would yet have that from which St Paul appealed to the heathen at Lystra and at Athens. I quite agree with the statement of a former speaker, that much of the popular infidelity is caused by circumstances, by the conditions in which the poor are placed—of mind, body, and estate. It is often mere ill-temper, or indisposition of spirit. The poor are often worried; they have had hard lives to live, and hard lines to travel by; they have a strong sense of wrongs real or imaginary; they have an idea that things are unequal and unjust; and hence their oft disappointments, and their political or social disaffection. Another main principle of action I would mention; any one who proposes to deal with popular infidelity must make frequent use of illustration. This is the easiest vehicle by which to convey thoughts and ideas to their minds. I would here urge, that in doing this, we require them to press their analogies to their legitimate conclusions, and that we do likewise with our own analogies. It is not long since that an infidel lecturer in one of these Staffordshire towns made a great point of this seeming illustration. Asking the question "Whither goes the soul after death?" the lecturer answered, "When the harp-string is broken, whither goes the sound?" Now this was a mixing up of two things that are essentially different, a passive instrument and an active responsible life, thus claiming an analogy where in reality there exists only an antithesis. A harp-string has no life, no consciousness, no conscience here to warn it of hereafter. A harp-string has, no doubt, often trembled to a false note

but it has never trembled to a false note "with fear and trembling," conscious it was to be responsible before a judge. From a broken harp-string proceeds only sound, and not life; but when the soul departs from the body, there issues forth a life, and not a mere sound that is lost in nothingness. There is thus no analogy, and the illustration fails, and so far the argument it was intended to establish. A mistake is sometimes made by Christian advocates, when they lay all the stress on Faith and none on Reason. These twain go together. There was much reason, and at the same time much faith, in Sir John Franklin's attempt to discover the North-West Passage; and there was reason and great faith in Sir John Franklin on the part of those that went forth in quest of him. It was through reason that Livingstone conceived the idea that Central Africa contained certain elements conducive to the development of commerce and civilisation, but there was a wide margin of faith in his enterprise that led him to devote himself to the task; and when Livingstone was a long time missing, it was faith in Livingstone that led Mr Stanley to go forth to seek him; and in the attempt evidence grew upon all these, reminding us of the words of the Poet Laureate—

> "We have but faith, we cannot know,
> For knowledge is of things we see;
> And yet we know it comes from Thee,
> A ray in darkness: let it grow."

The true evidence, however, must be within the man; and this evidence, though unseen, is not unworthy of the contemplation of the sceptic, for it is outwardly manifested and known. This is expressed in the words of a simple poem—

> "A man of subtle reasoning asked
> A peasant if he knew,
> Where is the internal evidence
> That proves the Bible true.
>
> "The terms of disputative art
> Had never reached his ear,
> He laid his hand upon his heart
> And simply answered—Here!"

DISCUSSION.

Rev. John W. Bardsley, M.A., Incumbent of St Saviour's, Liverpool.

The preceding speakers have surrounded this platform to-night with an atmosphere of scholarship and learning, and the tones of the magnificent paper of the Venerable Archdeacon are still ringing in my ears. It is therefore with some diffidence that I stand up to make a few remarks upon the subject which to-night particularly claims our interest. I wish to state as my own personal experience, that we have in professing Christendom at this time, to a far greater extent than most of us are aware, a crumbling creed, and that there is going on in our midst, to a far greater extent than most of us would be willing to admit, a disintegration of religious belief. What is the Church doing to meet this state of things? I believe it would be possible to show that in some respects the Church, instead of checking it, has been doing something to foster it. I would not pain my audience to-night by bringing to their ears facts which are within my own knowledge. I will only say that there are those who, having religious difficulties, have gone to their clergyman to have them solved, and have there met with a

laughing incredulity, instead of a sympathetic and sorrowful attempt to explain those difficulties as they best could be explained. Moreover, from a religious point of view, I fear we are to some extent confirming this popular unbelief, because too often some of our clergymen are ready to consign to the class of sceptics men who are just as orthodox, just as conscientious, but it may be a little better informed than themselves. I wish to re-echo the statement made by the Venerable Archdeacon when I say, that the clergy are so pre-occupied that they have no time to read books of science, and scarcely time to search the Scriptures accurately, and to ascertain for themselves how marvellously God's Word is in accord with some of the discoveries of modern science, and therefore it is that having received from those who went before traditional beliefs, they are tying mediæval crudities around the neck of eternal verities, and are in this way, in the mind of some, increasing that unbelief, which they would be only too glad to be able to disperse. I also think it would be well if the clergy distinguished between what I may call voluntary unbelief, and the difficulties of belief. There are among us many men who are wilful unbelievers, and our Church must adopt one form of treatment for them, but must adopt a very different method for those who are realising the difficulties of belief. To the former class, viz., those who are wilful unbelievers, belongs, I believe, much of the unbelief, I will not say atheism, but semi-scepticism of the present day. Men would not deny the existence of a God, if we would concede to them that He might be a God afar off. The true Christian wants, on the other hand, a God who is everywhere present. I believe there are men who are prepared to grant us the existence of a God, if we are willing to thrust Him out of the world of nature which He has made, if we will only expel Him out of the Word of Revelation which He has given, and if we will exclude Him from the kingdom of providence which He controls. But we must take clear and firm ground; we must assert that God is here in our midst. We must tell these men that they cannot expel God. What does it matter how men may multiply the links in the order of nature, we must come back to the first supreme cause. The Archdeacon quotes the memorable words of Sir John Herschell, who has said in reference to molecules that they have all the appearance of manufactured articles, and, therefore, in the face of scepticism, even these little molecules seem to proclaim, each one by itself, "It is He who hath made us and not we ourselves." In the same way as regards revelation, if it is passed through a system of fair criticism there can be no objection; but is it not strange that though this Word of God has been, as it were, battered and beaten, the divine element has still survived? Time was that when the brains were out the life was gone; but God's Word lives and abides still in our midst—"Time writes no wrinkles upon its brow." It suits the necessities of us all, just as it suited the necessities of our fathers who went before us. It proclaims for itself, just as the molecules in nature proclaim, that it is the Word of the living God. Therefore we must tell these men clearly and firmly that as they cannot expel God from nature, and that as they cannot expel God from His Word, so, in the same way, they cannot expel God from the sovereignty of the throne of their hearts, and that not only for the deeds which they do, not only for the words which they speak, but for every thought and intent of their hearts they will have to give account of themselves to God. But while this is the ground which we must take up with one school, very, very different is the course we must pursue with regard to the other. We cannot deal too tenderly with those who have difficulties in belief. What was our Lord's treatment? We know that our Lord did speak hard sayings, very hard sayings, so that many went away and followed Him no more. When, however, our Lord saw the wind scattering the chaff, He saw, also, the true grain shaken on the floor, and, therefore, He *pleaded with them*, "Will ye also go away?" "To whom shall we go?" said Simon Peter, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." Here is the argument with which I would meet the difficulties of those people who want to believe, people who long for eternal life, people who are clinging to their broken craft amidst storm and tempest. We must deal very tenderly with those; we must go to them and ask what other system has done for man's physical

nature what Christianity has done? We must remind them that the Sabbath of the Bible is not a national badge, but a universal boon, and ask to what other system shall we go for such a blessing? So, as regards the morality of the world, I can tell Mr Hutton that the common people can appreciate what I may call the popular argument. They can appreciate the words of Guizot, who was no mere popular man, but the leader of a party, and the author of expressions which have enriched the linguistic currency of the world. Some one asked him what would cure the social and moral disorders of France; he replied in these simple words, "In France men do not believe in God, and so they will not believe in one another, for there can be no political and social faith where there is no religious faith. France wants the circulation of God's Word." Yes, and where shall we go for light and immortality except to Christianity. Thou alone hast the words of eternal life.

The Rev. Canon Titcomb.

I CERTAINLY am unable to say what Mr Maguire did, that I never argued with an assembly of infidels. As one of the council of the Christian Evidence Society of London, it has been my lot on several occasions to stand up in Bradlaugh's Hall of Science, in the neighbourhood of Mr Maguire himself, and to deal with many popular objections to Christianity, ranging between those of atheism and of the milder forms of scepticism. I can, therefore, bear testimony to the statement which was made by the reader of the first paper, that jesting upon the Bible is one of the most common things current in those assemblies; jesting more especially with regard to the character of God as a God of severity, and whose justice, according to their statements, positively amounts to cruelty. In connection with this, I can also bear testimony to the great importance of what another speaker alluded to, viz., dealing with the argument by way of illustration. I remember on one occasion a speaker rose, and with great apparent unction criticised the Law of Moses as an exhibition of outrageous cruelty, because under the Levitical Dispensation, a slave, when he desired to be freed from his master, was appointed to have his ear nailed with an awl to the door of the house. He made great capital of that, and, of course, caused a great deal of laughter at the expense of what all Christians in the room regarded with the greatest solemnity. When it was my turn to rise up and speak, I ventured to deal with this just as we have been recommended to-day—by way of illustration. Folding my arms most quietly, I looked the man in the face, and said, "Sir, have you a wife, or have you a daughter?" He nodded assent. "Do they wear earrings?" said I; at which everybody, seeing what I was driving at, began to titter, and the laugh was against him. Of course I need not go on with the story, but by illustrating it in that way, and showing how willing young women (and old ones, too, for the matter of that) are to submit to have their ears bored, the whole argument against God, as a God of cruelty, fell to the ground. I could give you many instances of the same kind, but this not being a popular meeting so much as a meeting for reasoning, in which we are to advise each other touching difficulties, seeing what are the popular arguments against Christianity, and how we are to meet them, I have merely put down a note or two, illustrating one topic which has not been referred to in any of the papers, and which is a pressing, practical, most important, and though not a difficult, yet a very interesting question to solve. We have it in magazines, in books, in speeches, and in conversation in our drawing-room that modern civilisation is rapidly putting out of sight, and beyond the pale of common usage, the first rudiments and principles of the Gospel. Now that may perhaps to some who are not aware of it sound strange, but when I tell you that there are certain texts of Scripture, culled especially from the Sermon on the Mount, which are made to wage war against the usages and necessities of modern civilisation, you will see how important it is for us to deal with them and have a clear answer in regard to them. It is written, for example, "Take no thought for the morrow." But what says the infidel?

"How could commerce be carried on, except by foresight and all those prudent maxims, councils, and sagacious processes which commerce requires, with regard to the future? Does not the merchant need to lay up stores for the voyage; and when the voyage shall be over, for the processes of sale?" It is written again, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth." "Yet how, unless there be an accumulation of property, can there be capital?" cries the infidel. "According to the usages of modern society it is necessary for our intercourse one with the other, no less than to provide employment for the masses around us." Excellent arguments! But altogether defeated by the consideration of other parts of Scripture. In the first place, "Be not careful for to-morrow" is (as my reverend friends behind me will testify) a Greek phrase, which means "Be not over anxious about to-morrow." It has nothing whatever to do with any prohibition touching prudence or sagacious foresight, or laying up stores for the time to come. Secondly, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." Did it never occur to you that our Lord, while on earth, used the language of hyperbole, which was common to Eastern nations; and for which we must always make allowance when we remember that the Bible is an Oriental book, and not a book constructed on the framework of our Western thought? Nevertheless, in spite of language such as that, we have evidence in other parts of Scripture which shows distinctly how capital may be accumulated, and how all things required by commerce are abundantly sanctioned. Take the parable of the talents. Or such a passage as this:—"Parents ought to lay up for their children, not children for their parents." Again, "If any man will not work neither let him eat." Another argument very common amongst these men is, that our Lord laid down principles, as when He said "Resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also,"—which would, if they were carried out, encourage violence, and destroy all independence of character between man and man. In reply to this, however, we have nothing to do but fall back once more upon the fact that, while our blessed Lord was speaking with all the freeness and fulness of Oriental hyperbole, it was not at the expense of common sense. That the apostles even themselves felt and understood this, is manifest. For we read of St Paul in prison, absolutely violating the interpretation which the infidel would put upon our Lord's words; alleging with all the boldness which independence of character and self-respect could demand, "Nay, let them come themselves and fetch us out!" Thus, while he would not resist evil on principles which are opposed to Christianity, yet he *did* resist it upon principles which were concurrent with Christianity.

The Rev. Canon Walsham How.

I RISE to tell two short stories, and to draw a deduction from them. The first is this: Some time ago a great friend of mine was addressing a large number of working-men in a factory during a mission. At the end of his address one of the men, a foreman in the works, got up and proposed a vote to his fellow-workmen to the effect that this gentleman should never come and speak to them again. This was seconded and carried by a large majority. Of course my friend was somewhat troubled at this result of his address, and he sought out the man the next day. He said to him, "I suppose you are an unbeliever?" "I am," said the man. My friend then said, "I should like to have a little talk with you." The man said, "I should like nothing better than a good argument." So my friend invited him to his house; and he came there, and they had a talk. The man began by bringing forward some little difficulty he had found in the Bible. To which my friend answered, "I cannot talk to you about this; I will allow that there are difficulties. I cannot explain everything; but I want you to believe one fact—and that is, the power of the Spirit of God in enabling a man to lead a holy life." Of course the man laughed at that, but my friend stuck to his text, and in several conversations (for he saw the man several times) he went on insisting upon the beauty of a holy life, and bringing before him instances of holiness of living, until at last the

man was fully convinced that there is such a power in the world. And that man is at this time a communicant of the Church of England.

My second story is this: There was an infidel lecturer who had his post in one of the streets of South London, and he happened (as he would say, accidentally) to stroll one day into the parish church hard by, where he heard a sermon preached by one whom I am thankful to see amongst us to-night, a sermon simply telling the old story of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It was not an argumentative sermon, but simply a setting forth of the work and character of our blessed Saviour. That man found at that time what satisfied his soul; it was not argument which convinced him, but it was the exhibition of the Saviour as He simply is. And *that* man, also, is now a communicant of the Church of England. Now I am going to draw my deduction. It is this: that, highly as we value, and must always value those grand arguments, many of which have been brought before us to-night—such arguments, for example, as that in that wonderful book, "The Unseen Universe," an argument drawn out with marvellous power by Archdeacon Reichel; or the arguments of Canon Titcomb, in that book which must be known to many of you, "Cautions for Doubters;" greatly as we value these, they will not stand alone, they must be backed up and supported by that which is, in its force and power, the strongest argument of all to the popular unbeliever of the day; namely, the argument of a holy life. We must show that there is a power which is able to do for a man what nothing else can do—a power that can make him pure, that can make him holy, that can make him self-sacrificing—a power that can make the life of a man not only these, but more than these, bright, hopeful, happy, heavenly. We must show that the creed of the Christian is not only the creed of civilisation, the creed of humanity, the creed of progress, though it is all these, but besides these, that it is a creed upon which a man may hang his whole hopes, and his whole eternal destiny. Show this, and you will very often gain a man when all your arguments, however clever, however well reasoned, however unanswerable, have failed.

Now just let me say one word with regard to myself and my brother clergy. Most of us have, I am afraid, in our parishes, some who are troubled with, and some who have voluntarily entertained doubts as to the truth of Christianity. How shall we meet them? I would say simply this; in whatever other way we try to meet them, let us show that we ourselves believe from the bottom of our hearts in Christianity, let us show by our ceaseless and patient ministrations, by our loving work among our people, by our self-devotion and self-sacrifice, that the things we speak of we speak of not professionally, but because we believe them utterly; and let those people who watch us (and, depend upon it, they are always watching the clergy for this) to see what we think and what we believe, let them be constrained to judge thus:—"These men speak and live as men who know that the things they speak, and the things they profess to believe, are everlastingly true."

Rev. Richard W. Randall, M.A., Incumbent of All Saints, Clifton, Bristol.

I suppose it is impossible to conceive a more moving sight, or a more moving subject, than the sight which meets the eye of every one in this room to-night, and the subject which is placed before us:—moving, I mean, for this special reason, that we are here not to speculate as mere theorists, but we are gathered together as practical men; and the very manner in which the question of this evening has been presented to us seems to me to be calculated to touch all hearts who are considering this vast subject. For we are here to consider how we may meet the arguments of unbelief, not that we may gain a victory for ourselves, but that we may enter into that which is the deepest of all sorrows, the sorrow of the man who in this world has lost somehow the one light of the heart which comes from belief in God; the sorrow which makes the deepest claim on

our commiseration that can be made; and that we may see what can be done to dispel this unbelief, and for this reason alone, I have come forward just at the close of the meeting to say a few words. It is impossible for any one to over-estimate the strength of the grand and noble arguments which have been brought before us to-night; but we are here as a Congress, not all of us as men full of scientific knowledge, or great powers of theology, yet still each one of us as a member of the Church, wishing to know of something that may be done to meet the arguments of unbelief. Now it struck me when some of the former speakers were enlightening and helping us by the noble thoughts which they have placed before us, that many a brave and anxious heart that desired to do something for its fellows might have said, "I can never argue with the quickness of thought of one of the speakers, or with the subtlety of the other." But there are one or two things that we all can do, and here is one:—If we come across any one who is beset by these religious difficulties, let us at once acknowledge that undoubtedly there are great difficulties connected with the mysteries of religion; let us at once say that we feel those difficulties ourselves, nay, that we could not believe that our religion really was able to do what it professes to be able to do, to manifest God to man, and to manifest man to himself, unless it was beset with difficulties, considering that in teaching those mysteries religion has to deal with the finite mind of man. Then let us further do this—I shall seem to be using what sounds like a paradox—when we are seeking to argue with unbelievers, let us sometimes be sure that the best way is not to argue at all. Our Divine Master again and again was asked questions which He simply put aside, but He so put aside those questions as to drive men into their own hearts to seek for the answer there; and depend upon it, again and again the man who brings forward difficulties which have occurred to him, or been suggested to him in the secret depths of his own heart, is more of a believer than he professes to be. It is well, therefore, to appeal to the faith, which really exists underneath or behind those difficulties, rather than to argue about the difficulties in detail. Lastly, and above all, let us remember that there is no argument for the truths of the faith like the argument of a Christ-like life. Once in my own time it happened to me to speak to one who had great powers of intellect, and I asked him, something in the same fashion as one of the former speakers has been asking you to-night, how he could account for the existence of such a character as is not to be found from the time when Adam's nature was ruined by the flaw of sin, all down the whole line of humanity, until the existence of that character which was formed and fashioned in our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ. I said, "Can you account for the sanctity of such a character? We can account for it as Christians, because we believe that the Life of God was united to the life of man, in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. Can you further account for this, that the life of our Blessed Lord has been reproduced in the lives of faithful Christians—Socrates influenced his followers, but they did not live over again the life of Socrates. But the characteristics of the Life of Jesus Christ, His meekness and gentleness, His love and piety, appear again in the lives of His followers. Can you account for this? We can. We believe that the Life of God mingles with, and changes the life of one who lives in union with Jesus Christ, because He is God." This thought moved and impressed him deeply. And so, depend upon it, that of all the arguments against the faith there is none so strong as the life of the proud, the selfish, the unloving, the worldly, the impure Christian;—and of all the arguments that may win man to believe, there is no argument like the character of a meek, gentle, loving, and unearthly Christian life. And there is no one in this Congress who cannot go home, and through the Power of the Holy Ghost who is given in the Church, draw into his own heart something more of the Life of Christ, and so do something to win unbelievers to faith in God.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, 6th OCTOBER.

The Right Reverend Bishop Piers Claughton, Chaplain-General, took the Chair at Seven o'clock, and read the following paper.

CHURCH WORK IN THE ARMY.

PAPERS.

In offering some remarks upon the subject of Church Work in the Army, I feel the greatest satisfaction in knowing that I am to be followed by two of my fellow-workers—each of them well fitted by experience, as well as ability, to discharge their task with success. My own connection with this particular field of spiritual work is too recent to justify me in attempting more than a few suggestions; so I will at once lay before you my thoughts, and ask my brothers to follow me with their words and valuable counsels on this most interesting portion of our common labours as ministers of Christ. And, first, let me remind you that there is not that great difference between soldiers and other men which is commonly supposed. Even in the soldier of long service you will find that the right way to treat him is (sometimes at least) to forget the peculiar character of his trials and difficulties, and address him as you would any other Christian man whom you desire to quicken to a deeper sense of his religious duties and obligations. His prevailing temptation is to consider himself in a different condition of life from other men as to his duties towards God—to suppose that his temptations are not only greater, but so peculiar as to constitute almost an excuse for a lower standard of piety and goodness than is required of others. I do not, of course, deny that he *has* strong and peculiar temptations, demanding on the part of those who minister to him the greatest sympathy and loving consideration; but I mean that he has only to look exactly to the same source of aid and strength as his brethren "that are in the world" to find that aid surely given, and that strength sufficient. His temptations are chiefly those of his social condition—living very much in the sight of his comrades, and his actions challenging an immediate and often an unkind judgment on their part. Thus any change—especially in the direction of what is right—is marked and almost resented by those who are themselves averse to what is good; and equally any deflection he makes from his higher and better walk is hailed with a strange satisfaction; he is almost welcomed back to evil; and though it is easy to say he lacks moral courage in allowing himself to be influenced by these false friends, we are only describing his condition in so saying; what is wanted is to point out a remedy. Here, too, I maintain that we err if we think we must have a remedy *peculiar* to his case; he must be led to the One Helper, he must be taught to rely on the One Defence that is sufficient for any Christian man—the grace and protection promised by Christ Himself; he must put on the "armour of God," which is faith, the "*shield*," which alone can "quench

all the fiery darts of the wicked ; " he must use the appointed *means* of grace—prayer—the Word—the Sacraments. I know that I may be here met by an objection which has much force, yet still in my judgment is a mistaken objection. It may be said, Your soldier is tempted by *peculiar social* difficulties ; give him peculiar *aids*, prop him up in his weakness, let him be supported by some additional *social* supports. And very great and praiseworthy efforts, I know, are made to provide exactly the sort of protection and encouragement which, it is presumed, he requires. I do not wish to offer discouragement to any lawful means or ways of giving aid to soldiers as to other men. I should feel it a very serious responsibility to oppose any, especially such as have commended themselves to those who are actually engaged in the efforts to reclaim to what is right (and to strengthen when reclaimed) men exposed, as soldiers are, to such terrible temptations, and, in former times, I fear, left to struggle alone against a very host of active enemies, more deadly than those they met in the shock of battle—that, in a peculiar sense, peace to them was no peace—but their very time of danger. I am only anxious that the aid we offer should be of that character which will not either fail them or disappoint ourselves ; and I am strongly of opinion that we shall fail if we do not bring the real heart of the man to "lean only" on God. It is a prevailing (and I fear a growing) error to trust in human aids—human as devised by man as well as depending on man ; it is an error not confined to any party or shade of religious thought. Let the soldier, then, I would say, be taught courage in his religion as well as in his worldly duty. Let him, in short, be a *man*, in the truest sense, which is neither pride nor self-confidence, nor superstition, but *faith*—belief in a Redeemer, and the conviction that whilst a soldier of his country he is also a soldier of Christ, pledged to fight manfully under His banner, whilst to carry on the fight he is a sharer in every promise, and provided with every aid that is enjoyed by his brethren in other vocations, even as it was said by His Divine Master of one who belonged to his own, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."

There is another topic on which I wish to offer some remarks. What I chiefly desire in the army is a different policy in the selection of its "materials." I should like to see the ranks of our soldiers filled, in a different manner to that which at present prevails, by an outlay upon education which—without, as I believe, laying fresh burdens on the national expenditure, would bring in a most excellent return—even as a matter of political economy. I should desire to see military schools established in all central positions, where, first, the children of our soldiers, and next, any available member of the sons of our labouring classes, might receive a thorough education, fitting them for the position of soldiers on conditions which, without in the least interfering with the rights of parents, would hold out substantial benefits to their children, and make the military vocation a social benefit, rather than (what too many consider it to be) a necessary evil. We have the same idea already carried out—though not as yet on a sufficient scale—in the navy. It is, as it appears to me, an obvious truth which sooner or later politicians will discover for themselves, that to leave the two important interests of this great nation—its army and its navy (as to the men)—mainly to chance, is simply a gigantic mistake. But it is not the political question which I am concerned to

bring before you on this occasion. I am chiefly anxious that we should leaven the army with an element which we cannot wonder is at present almost entirely wanting—a class of men already trained up in religious habits, and taught to entertain a higher sense of duty than mere obedience to discipline. I need not do more than suggest what invaluable aid would thus be contributed to the cause of discipline by such a provision; and I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that the work of the chaplain or minister of religion would be still more materially advanced and assisted.

There is another point to which this suggestion leads me, and one, in my opinion, of no little importance. At present one great obstacle with chaplains in visiting one portion of their flock is the difficulty of getting sufficient access to recruits—those, in fact, who are in the greatest need of their attention, and with whom as yet none of the ordinary drawbacks of military life have had time to operate—young men, fresh from the country village or the town—the one not wholly without willingness to be addressed on religious topics; the other too often indifferent to such advice, but only therefore the more in need of it. These, at first, are so entirely occupied with learning the elements of their soldier-life as to be almost out of the chaplain's reach. Yet the first few weeks have a most important influence upon their subsequent character. In point of fact (irrespective of all religion), the seeds of military disaffection are often then implanted by that lack of consideration which is sometimes found in those who have the training of them. It is a fatal mistake to suppose that words of kindness are out of place whilst teaching discipline, or that it is "kindness in the end" to let the rude untaught minds "feel the roughness of the new life all at once and get over it," as it is thought. The story of early punishments, confinements, extra drills, ending in disaffection, too often in desertion itself, would read a very different lesson if it was studied. Take the other side: a number of educated young soldiers would at once be an example and an encouragement to the recruits, whilst the chaplain would have (what he continually needs) a body of young men into which he could draft the new-comers as he got his influence over them. The non-commissioned officer would find his labour lightened, for he would have *willing* learners, and (no unimportant consideration) instead of the letters of the recruit to his friends conveying only harsh reflections upon his new life and his associates, he would be able to express his satisfaction with the state of things around him. I need not enlarge on this point, and we hope that it will commend itself to those in authority, who I know are most anxious to benefit the army, and who, I still believe, would find no great difficulty in obtaining the support of all reasonable men in making such an experiment.

Let me say, in addition, that I do not for a moment suppose that we can dispense with recruiting, or procure an entire army in the manner I have supposed. It must always be the case that young men, for many reasons, will be desirous to enter the army, and it is for the advantage of the country that the number should be rather increased than lessened. It is not within the province of the present discussion to enter into this part of the question. I shall be more than satisfied if what I have said should appear worthy of attention, either in the present meeting or on any future occasion. I will only add, in conclusion, that I am confident that the character of those who have devoted themselves to ministerial

work in the army will bear comparison with any other section of our clergy at work either at home or abroad; and that I esteem it a cause of deep thankfulness, to find myself, however unworthy, called to be their chief pastor. May wisdom and strength not mine own be given to me to fulfil the work, for which, my friends and brethren, I earnestly beseech your prayers.

The Venerable Archdeacon Wright.

In considering this very important subject, "The Church in the Army," my attention is at once drawn:—(1.) To the office of Chaplain-General; (2.) to the Chaplains under his authority; (3.) to the Soldiers to whom the Chaplain-General and the Chaplains minister.

To have the most effectual spiritual care of our army, the office of Chaplain-General must be most efficiently filled, and the chaplains of the army selected with the greatest possible caution. I purpose, therefore, first to examine how the office of Chaplain-General may be most efficiently filled, and how chaplains may be secured, best adapted to minister to the soldier—and then to consider how, under God, the best spiritual influences may be exercised on the soldier. Of course, at a great Church Congress like this, it is the duty of every speaker to deliver his honest opinion—there must be no reserve. And to this duty I was glad to hear the Right Rev. the Chaplain-General so warmly urge us. All must have admired the humility with which in his opening address his lordship confessed his want of army experience, and his readiness to learn of those who have long studied the soldier and soldier's life. His kindness and gentleness must have won the esteem of all whom I am now addressing. While, then, I shall speak with perfect plainness, I may be permitted to say, that no one can offer to our respected chairman a more hearty allegiance than I. Let it therefore be fully understood, that in giving my opinions freely, my sole object is to suggest what I believe in my heart to be for the true interest of the Church in the Army.

1st. What should be the position of the Chaplain-General to render his office most effectual for good?

It is often asked, should he be a bishop specially consecrated for army work? I answer, No, he should not, inasmuch as it would be most inconvenient and highly irregular. I say that with perfect confidence, because I am supported in my judgment by the decision of both Houses of Parliament, and especially so by the bishops of our Church. And further, on the Continent, the Gallican Church repudiates a military episcopate, as opposed to the great principle of rule in the Church of Christ; while in Germany so dangerous has the experiment proved that at the present moment the chaplains of the Roman Catholic soldiers are in the anomalous position of being spiritually responsible to no one. They do certain duties and receive certain pay; the government gives them orders, but they have no spiritual head in the land. All this, as regards Germany, arose from the interdict put forth by the army bishop, Namzsanowski; the military church of St Pantaleone in Cologne having been declared by him defiled, because Alt-Catholics had been allowed to worship in it.

But let us at present keep to our own country and our own army. In March 1868, Mr Gleig, world-known for his gallant career as a com-

batant soldier, and as a writer of many interesting books on many subjects, put forth an article in "Blackwood" urging the all importance of a bishop for the army. The style of the writing is charming, but curiously enough Mr Gleig maintains that to secure this bishopric we must revert to an evil which had only been recently removed. We all know how wretchedly anomalous were "*peculiars*." Only a few years ago Bocking and Hornchurch in Essex, standing within the territorial limits of the dioceses of London and Rochester, looked to the Archbishop of Canterbury as their ordinary; while Rochdale, standing of old within the diocese of Chester, came under the direct jurisdiction of the Primate. The result was, all parishes known as "*peculiars*" were, as regards episcopal care, utterly neglected: and to escape the disgrace an Act of Parliament was passed, doing away with these special jurisdictions, and connecting all "*peculiars*" by law as well as by custom with the prelates in whose diocese they happen to stand. Mr Gleig argues that all camps, barracks, hospitals, arsenals, &c., should be made extra-parochial, and not witht heir chaplains given over "to the prelates in whose dioceses they happen to stand" (a most wise, because a thoroughly decent and orderly arrangement), but that a bishop should be especially consecrated to have episcopal authority over such districts. In other words the country was invited by him "to go back to that order of things on an enlarged scale which was abolished on a small scale in 1842." Yes, he might have added, and over these restored anomalies, I propose, to have by law established a roving suffragan, who shall intrude at pleasure into every diocese of the land, and that intruder shall have, as regards the army, no episcopal function whatever that he can exercise, save to confirm; and the exercise of that function would be highly disturbing, confirmation of soldiers having always been a work in which the bishop of the diocese has taken special pleasure, and that for this among other reasons, it brings the soldier and his chaplain into happy communication with their diocesan. Shortly after the appearance of this remarkable article, an Act was drawn up to carry out the plan so strongly pressed by the late Chaplain-General; but when it was introduced into the House of Lords the wisdom of as brave, as true, as discerning, as hard-working, and as holy a bishop as ever wore mitre—I mean Samuel Wilberforce—saw the impending danger; so did the Archbishop of York, and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and others; and the hope of an army bishop over sixty chaplains was happily, through them, utterly annihilated by an amendment as simple as it was effectual. As first drawn up, the wording of the Act ran thus:—"It shall be lawful for the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, to declare all or any of the extra-parochial districts set out under the provisions of this Act, to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of an Archbishop or Bishop of the United Church, &c." That would have admitted, by an after arrangement, the consecration of a bishop for the army as Chaplain-General. But now came the amendment (I think it was proposed by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol):—"And it shall be lawful for such archbishop or bishop to exercise over any army chaplain within any such extra-parochial district, all the power and authority which he is by law authorised to exercise *over any clerk in orders of the said United Church holding any preferment in his diocese.*" The amendment was passed and the military bishop happily avoided. There cannot then be a bishop specially consecrated for the army—a bishop exercising by

right and legally episcopal functions all over the land, simply because such a bishop would have no diocese. Only last week I returned from a tour through Northern France and through Germany, from the Rhine to the Baltic. I made very close inquiry as to the government of the chaplain department in each country. In France the arrangement is like our own. They have a principal chaplain, who is a priest residing in Paris, and in connection with the Archbishop of Paris and the Minister of War. The several army chaplains are instructed by the Chaplain-General, as with us, as regards military orders, but each is licensed and watched over as regards matters spiritual, by the bishop of the diocese in which he is serving. In Germany the Lutheran and Calvinist chaplains (they are taken from both bodies) have over them a "Feld Propst" (Field Provost), corresponding exactly with our Chaplain-General. The Roman Catholics, as I have already stated, are left to themselves and the Minister of War.

I have, I trust, thus far made it perfectly clear, that there cannot, as matters now stand, be a military bishop for our army, such a dignitary being forbidden both by ecclesiastical and statute law. Thankful indeed ought we to be, that we have escaped another of those sad, and sooner or later destructive experiments, which in these days of rash meddling have so lacerated a Church whose motto is "Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order."*

If, then, the Chaplain-General should not be a bishop specially consecrated for the army, what for the best interests of the army should he be?

He should, if possible, be one thoroughly acquainted with the orders and regulations of Her Majesty's service, who has long lived with the soldier, and studied closely his many virtues, and not less his special vices, and the way to meet them. The old chaplain knows almost every regiment, and almost every regiment knows him. From twenty to thirty

* The Act of Parliament is simply permissive, and, as regards its practical worth, utterly useless. War Office property is ever increasing and decreasing, and in every large garrison runs into several parishes. The extra-parochial districts allowed by the Act would therefore require frequent worrying alterations, and so causes of trouble with the parochial clergy would be constantly cropping up. This and many other reasons invite the authorities to be passive. All is quiet now: wisdom says, "let well alone." As to the latter part of the Act, permitting the Church in the Army being placed under the jurisdiction of an already overworked archbishop or bishop, Mr Gleig shows clearly that such an arrangement cannot be. It would have been well had the intrusion, here so stoutly and so wisely repudiated by the gallant old soldier, been remembered by him when he advocated the consecration of a roving military bishop: —

"The Government may bring in a bill to legalise past irregularities, and to place for the future naval and military stations and naval and military persons under the special jurisdiction of some particular bishop, say the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London. But, in the first place, is it probable that either of these prelates, or any other member of a hierarchy which complains already of being overworked, would consent to have such an enormous increase of responsibility and labour heaped upon him? and if so brave and energetic a bishop could be found, what is there that should lead us to believe that the other bishops would consent to an arrangement so derogatory to their rights and privileges? No bishop would willingly allow the bishop of another diocese to intrude into his diocese and interfere in his proper work. No archbishop of a province would tolerate such intrusion if attempted by the suffragan of another archbishop or by that archbishop himself. We doubt whether any Government would propose to Parliament that the law which establishes the independence of diocesan bishops should be overriden. We are confident that whatever the House of Commons might do, the House of Lords would reject such a proposal."—*Blackwood's Magazine*, March 1868, p. 271.

years they have gone over the world together; they have not seldom campaigned together—yes, and have learned heartily to esteem one the other. And then, too, the old chaplain knows the powers and the weaknesses of those with whom he has so long laboured. And not only that, from years of close intercourse with the chaplains of the army, he is intimately acquainted with their character and capacity—a very necessary and important experience for one who is to be their head, and who will have to place them where each will be found most useful.

I would further suggest that the Chaplain-General should be specially connected with the London District, by taking spiritual charge of Her Majesty's Guards. The work during the week would be carried on as at present by three chaplains, but on Sunday the Chaplain-General should be a ministering priest. His church should be a pattern church, and his services pattern services. Under him should be an able chaplain of the first class, and two military curates; the age of the latter never under twenty-eight. When on Sunday the Chaplain-General could take the duty, he should be aided by one of the military curates, and the first-class chaplain go to one of the London barracks. When not able, because engaged in some garrison away from London, the first-class chaplain should take his place, and then the Chaplain-General would be able, save when on leave, to give to the army every Sunday, either in London or elsewhere, the value of his experience and his position, and two military curates would, under his immediate guidance, be preparing for the time, when, as commissioned chaplains, they would have independent charges. If the military curate showed any sign of incapacity for the special work of the army, the Chaplain-General would at once inform him of his shortcoming, and so our troops escape a long and trying affliction. Generally speaking, the candidates for a commission would be found, after careful selection before trial, able ministers of God.

As the Chaplain-General has every year to visit the several stations in England, and about every third year those of Ireland, occupying him some thirteen weeks out of the fifty-two, it is evident that to be efficient he must not only be a man of long army experience, but also physically strong. To secure the army experience, and to encourage and reward those who minister to soldiers, he should always be selected from the chaplains, who are cut off, be it remembered, from all other advancement; to avoid physical weakness, retirement from the high office should be compulsory at seventy. Chaplains, who are stationary for five years, have to retire at sixty; the Chaplain-General, an officer severely tried, and at times crippled by various climates, will after seventy be little fitted for actively visiting the many stations throughout England and Ireland.

(2). Having thus freely spoken of the Church in the Army as regards the office and qualifications and work of the Chaplain-General, I will now consider what kind of men the chaplains of the army should be, how they should be chosen, and how supported.

In the days of the Great Frederick, every Prussian regiment had its chaplain. At the end of the last century it was the same in the French and English armies. With us the result of such an arrangement was terrible. In those days "chaplaincies like ensigncies, lieutenancies and companies, were disposed of without any regard to the fitness of the parties applying for them, the price increasing in proportion to the absence

from duty allowed the chaplain. It was generally found that the charms of the mess-table, rather than any desire to exercise a moral influence over the conduct and opinions of the soldiers, kept the chaplain at headquarters." Happily such things cannot now be. Still the question will arise, "What are the special qualifications for an army chaplain?"

To be worthy his position he must be a soul-loving, in other words, a Christ-loving man, a devoted believer in an Incarnate God. He should be physically thoroughly strong and mentally of a superior intellect; and with these qualifications he should further be a man of much discretion and of marked gentlemanly bearing. It may be said that such qualifications can never be obtained when it is remembered that the military chaplain has to go at a moment's notice to any place, and any climate, at any time, and on entering the army he gives up nearly all hope of advancement in the Church. I answer "Yes, they can, and with ease; provided honest endeavours are made to secure them." The pay of a commissioned chaplain commences with £250 a-year, and gradually advances to £600 a-year, with a retiring pension after twenty years' service, that pension increasing up to thirty years' service: and a pension for the chaplain's widow. But to secure the fitting man I have represented, the Minister of War and the Chaplain-General must be in thorough accord. The Chaplain-General should lay before the Minister of War the standard by which every candidate would be tested, and it should be fully understood that whether relative, friend, or stranger, no one would be admitted to a commission who did not in every way come up to that standard. If this were vigorously acted out, no note would come down from the Secretary of State for War, or other influential personage, suggesting, *i.e.*, commanding this or that clergyman to be placed on the list; in other words, no unqualified clergyman could enter the service. I am not implying that great injustice has in this way been done to the Church in the Army. Its chaplains can compare favourably with their brethren in civil life. Among them are sound scholars and men devoted to science; but we have, notwithstanding, had careless appointments, inflicting years of injury upon our troops.

But when the duly qualified chaplain has been obtained he will require a fitting place of worship in which to minister. We all must thankfully admit that the late Chaplain-General did much for the spiritual and mental well-being of the soldier, but I have often heard him say that the school-chapel system has proved a failure. To take the soldier to worship in a building with which he connects the worry and drudgery of school, every piece of furniture, the very ink-holes, inviting his thoughts to spelling, the multiplication table, and puzzling arithmetic, nothing telling of a house of God, is utterly unworthy a nation on which God has bestowed such inestimable blessings. As there is a special building in which the body of the soldier is duly exercised, so also should the chaplain have a separate building specially set apart for the exercise of the soldier's soul. This is a matter on which the clergy of the army think and speak most anxiously, and so do the officers and men.

But even when fitting places of worship shall have been provided, there will always exist the serious inconvenience of an ever-moving army; but that inconvenience would be greatly mitigated if, on every move of a regiment, certain returns were regularly and formally made by the chaplain of the garrison left, to the chaplain under whose spiritual care the regiment

was about to be placed. They should set forth the names of communicants, nominal lists of the married and their children, and of all the men, women, and children who have been confirmed, and of those who attend the Sunday school, and who teach therein. All this and much more ought to be done under instructions from the Chaplain-General, who should yearly issue a paper of questions to every chaplain, the answers to which would keep him well informed, touching the spiritual condition of every corps in the service. Further, every year the senior chaplains should meet the Chaplain-General, and consider with him certain *agenda*, to be the work of a synod of all the chaplains who could be in London, or at Aldershot, or elsewhere, on a certain day previously specified. I believe that if some such plan as this were carried out, the Church in the Army would be greatly benefited. The clergy would work well together, they would be encouraged by the support rendered through this discipline, and secure information which would render their united efforts more easy, more pleasant, and under God more effectual.

All this machinery, however, will be of little worth, if men of very extreme schools are introduced into the army as its spiritual guides. The Church of Christ in England can contain with safety the extreme evangelical—one of a body ever to be respected, for they it was who fought the great and glorious battle of anti-slavery, and boldly preached Christ when a mere cold morality was taught from our pulpits. It can also hold with safety the never weary, ever zealous ritualist, who in his heart, we are bound to believe, is as true to Christ's Holy Catholic Church as his forenamed brother. But it must never be forgotten that the soldier is marched to church; he is no free agent in the matter. He is, generally speaking, most forbearing, ready to receive thankfully a kind word from a chaplain of any school. All this, I say, makes it only the more necessary that not extreme men, but they who will plainly teach, as the Church directs, "pure doctrine, sacraments necessary for salvation, and a priesthood to minister the same," shall be appointed pastors for the soldier.

To obtain able and efficient clergy for the army much might be done, I would respectfully observe, by the Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor. If those high officers of the State would place at the disposal of the Chaplain-General yearly, two livings of about £400 a year, to be given to chaplains not under twenty years' service, who have distinguished themselves by a life of holy labour, I feel sure that the army at large would highly appreciate the gracious consideration, and the chaplain department would be powerfully benefitted. Clergy in civil life, who slave in our thickly populated manufacturing towns, well deserve rewards from those in power, but it is not, I trust, too much to hope for the small boon I have suggested for chaplains, who at a moment's notice must go to the ends of the earth.

Before leaving this part of my subject, I would suggest that much of the efficiency of the chaplain depends on his being as little moved about as possible. With the French and Prussians, the military chaplain is kept to one garrison. The five years' system in England is, I believe, in every way more conducive to good. It is a system of custom, not of law, and very wisely so. Still serious discontent must always arise from any capricious removal of chaplains, involving as it does a serious expenditure of money by a body of clergy not over-burdened with riches. This is a

matter to which the authorities will, I feel sure, ever give their careful consideration.

(3.) We now come to the soldier himself for whose spiritual well-being the Chaplain-General and the chaplains have to labour. How can that labour be best applied, and in what way can it be best supported?

A generation ago, the soldier when he enlisted looked upon the army as his home for twenty-one years. He was in his way contented, and every commanding officer felt that he had something permanent to work upon. Moreover, the recruits were then principally from the agricultural districts, and therefore more sturdy, more teachable, and more easily brought under military control. Physically, they always greatly improved; and although there was in those days but little schooling, the very fact that regiments were constantly travelling about at home and abroad was quite sufficient to render the man shrewd, sharp, and so to a certain extent mentally benefitted. As regards their spiritual state, they were almost entirely neglected, given over for the most part to the care of already over-worked parochial clergy. The chaplain department consisted of Mr Gleig the Chaplain-General, and under him five commissioned chaplains. When I was stationed in Cephalonia a little more than twenty-nine years ago, the soldiers worshipped in a barrack-room, a part of which was curtained off for three married men. There the poor wives had to hear language of the most disgusting character, and witness not seldom scenes too repulsive to mention. There were no vessels for Holy Communion, not even a surplice for divine service. Matters were very little better throughout the Mediterranean stations. Thus, as regards the soul of the soldier, everything was as bad as possible, save this one advantage, the regiment possessed the same men for many years, and in our colonies and possessions they continued under the same spiritual care for a comparatively long period. This advantage continued under the ten years' system, for re-engagement was almost general. But now, all is unstable; from the youngest recruit upwards, all is disquiet and anxiety. The six years' plan causes perpetual change, no man feels himself settled. All this in these transition days makes it only the more difficult to get at the soldier's soul. Again, the soldier is devoid of all home influences. He has no family in civil life to which he can go. He is devoid of all those softening influences which come from society with mothers, sisters, and respected female friends. He is, therefore, when tired driven by necessity to certain streets filled with public-houses, in which he finds the cheery song, the blazing fire, bright gas, a pint of beer and a pipe, *all for* 3*d.*, and not seldom with these are women of the lowest kind. This is the leading evil which meets every young soldier immediately he enlists. How is the chaplain, or how is any one, to help him effectually under such a trial? Soldiers' Institutes have been placed in every large garrison at home and on foreign stations, but after a few years they all failed, as they ever will, for they are dependent upon public charity, and have nearly always in them that miserable mingling of the conventicle and the club, which must speedily destroy the Institute, or turn it into a lodging-house, refreshment place, and lecture establishment for the public at large. No soldier should be begged for, no soldier should directly or indirectly be put forth as a mendicant. In every large garrison, there should be two or three well placed clubs, in every small

garrison one, supplied and superintended by the Government, just as the barrack-room, or the gymnasium, or the hospital is supplied. The soldier should feel that, when tired, he can go to his own club for which he will gladly pay, and there enjoy his game, and his paper, and his pipe, and, if he pleases, his glass of beer. All that would tend to improve the whole man, and hundreds, who now from almost dire necessity seek the low retreat of the prostitute and the drunkard, would be found enjoying themselves respectably in their own club-rooms. Until something be done of this kind, the chaplains of the army will have to struggle against a terrible foe indeed. During the winter months in these clubs, and in the barrack recreation-room, well arranged entertainments should be provided through the active assistance of the chaplain and officers of the garrison. By such an arrangement, the Church in the Army would be mightily aided.

I need hardly say that, as regards the married soldier, it is most important that his quarter should be such as shall enable him and his family to live, at least, decently together. The authorities have done much, very much in this direction, but there remains still a very great deal undone. Not seldom parents and three or four children live in one room, and the young are trained to scenes which must degrade them.

There should also be, as near as possible to the soldiers' barrack, a piece of ground on which he can enjoy manly games—quoits, cricket, bowls, and such like. He is young, for the most part; his animal spirits high; and every day he goes through a certain amount of wear and tear: every recreating occupation, every pleasing pursuit which tends to develop the body, and occupy the mind, should, therefore, be carefully encouraged. It is impossible to over-estimate the influence of those amusements within and without the barracks, whichencourage the soldier's self-respect, and so keep him from low and degrading society.

I cannot quit this part of my paper without making one more appeal to men in power, for they can do much for the Church in the Army. If they will give the soldier fair consideration, intelligent, able-bodied recruits will flock to the service, and the country have, within a few years, a special reserve of 30,000 men, who, on any great emergency, would prove of incalculable value. The soldier, remember, is a civilian improved —in other words, he is a civilian trained to arms, order, and obedience. Only add to that intelligence and sobriety, and we have in the formed soldier a candidate for public employ possessing the very highest qualifications. Let it then be notified that for the future the Heads of Departments will appropriate 30,000 of the 120,000 subordinate places at their disposal as rewards for military services, and the result will be gratifying indeed, and highly remunerative to all parties. The Secretary of State for War will bring forward the Army Estimates with a quiet mind, nay, with a smile of satisfaction; hard-working, poorly paid non-commissioned officers will have a cheering prospect before them; the pot-house will no longer see a recruiting-sergeant; the drunkards before the orderly-room door will be a tale of the past; military prisons will be all closed; and the country possess a body of servants in Government offices of the highest efficiency. In order to secure the necessary number of vacancies, every young soldier filling a civil service post might pay in weekly a sum sufficient to buy him an annuity at the age of fifty-five,

while every old soldier could fall back on his pension and savings. If something like this be done, a vast blessing must rest on the Church in the Army—if it be neglected the State will not have shown justice to the heroes of whom it professes to be so gratefully proud.

As regards the spiritual labours of chaplains, and any who may help them, they would be seen in (1.) Bible classes and Church teaching; (2.) The visitation of the sick; (3.) Room to room visiting in the married quarters; (4.) The encouragement of guild union; and, though last not least, in (5.) Periodical missions.

Time will not permit me to say much on these most important subjects, but one statement I may safely make, which is, that I have always found my work in the army the most blessed when most zealously I visited the sick in hospital, and the married families in their quarters. Without that, all must fail; with it, religion is sure to increase. And this comfort the chaplain always has, these two fields are ever clear to him, and the more he toils in them, the more will God bless his labours.

I have mentioned Bible classes and Church teaching. There is nothing more difficult than to carry on steadily and successfully a Bible class with soldiers; and for this reason, when the soldier has been closely occupied, and at times hard-worked within his barracks, his desire is to get away from the barrack-square and the barrack-room. It is, therefore, difficult beyond measure to get him to give up an hour or more of his time for recreation, and especially so, if by his act he has openly to declare himself before the whole world to be a religious man. The taunts and the jokes he has to bear, and the revilings should he on any occasion be found inconsistent, are serious and violent impediments. Do not misunderstand me. A few may always be gathered together, but to keep up a Bible class, unless the chaplain is assisted, and the soldier supported, by an officer or officers of the corps, is found by every chaplain and army Scripture reader to be exceedingly difficult. I would, therefore, suggest this as a plan which might with safety, I think, be adopted. There are the adjutant and sergeant-major who, with their other duties, see to the drilling of the soldier; a musketry instructor to teach the proper use of the rifle; a gymnasium instructor to encourage the most effectual exercise of the soldier's every muscle; a schoolmaster to strengthen and improve his mind; and a medical officer to guard his health. Each of these has certain hours during which he may carry out his duties with the men, and a certain place is allotted for his work. So should it be with the chaplain. Three times a week we instruct the boys and girls of our garrison at Portsmouth; three times a week we hold divine service in our military hospital for the sick; but our instruction for the healthy grown-up soldier is confined to a sermon of fifteen, or at the outside twenty minutes, and many a soldier is not present three Sundays in succession. I would, therefore, hope that erelong the chaplain in every garrison will have allotted to him one room in which he may systematically give instruction twice every week in the morning for one hour to any soldiers who may wish to receive it, such soldiers during those two hours being free from other duty. There would be no difficulty then. The class would, I believe, be well attended, because duly recognised by authority.

Lastly, every other year in every garrison there should be a well arranged Mission, carried on by devoted and discreet clergy. I say

discreet clergy, because the army is a very delicate machine, and must ever be wisely and carefully handled, especially in matters of religion. I believe that under God, nothing would more lift up the hands of the chaplains, and more support the Church in the Army, than such a system of mission labour. And if with these Missions we could effectually unite the work of the Army Guild, with which I am so glad to find the Chaplain-General has connected himself and his office, then might we indeed expect an inestimable blessing.

My Lord Bishop, my Brother Clergy, and Christian Friends, I have already, I fear, exceeded my time. I have endeavoured to put clearly before you a few suggestions touching the great work of the Church in the Army. If I have ever given one small hint which shall tend to make Christ more loved by our gallant soldiers, my words will not have been in vain. The weakness of my paper is all my own—any tittle of it that shall be blessed, to God be the glory!

The Rev. J. C. Edghill, Chaplain to the Forces, Aldershot.

The army has of late years occupied much of men's attention; there is a wondrously increasing interest in it, not merely among our statesmen, but in the nation generally. In all the changes of the last few years we can trace this newly-awakened interest. Probably none of these changes have done so much good, or so much evil, as was predicted of them: but this much is certain, that the condition of our soldiers, in respect of health, comfort, and education, was never so well cared for as now. "When I look back fifteen or twenty years," many an old soldier has said to me, "I am astonished at the advance." The canteens under regimental government, the generally improved married quarters, the libraries and recreation rooms, the educational advantages, all these things are good in themselves and in their influences. No minister of Jesus Christ can look at them with jaundiced eye, with indifference, or disdain. The question then naturally presses upon us, has the Church kept pace with the State in doing her duty to her children in the army? Has her work been also progressive? Is she using her God-given power in making this progress a moral progress, thus insuring the real elevation of our soldiers? Has the general awakening in the Church of England reached the army?

(2.) Soldiers are not what they were; their minds are not inactive. Knowledge and thought of some sort or other are not wanting among them. The old traditional respect for superiors in rank is waxing weak, the old relationship between officers and men is passing away. For better or for worse, this is a fact; and no wailing over the past, and no regretful longings for the old feelings and the blind reverence can restore them. We may shut our eyes to these changes, and assert they are not there because we do not see them, *but there they are.* Elements of danger lie on the surface; vanity, self-sufficiency, insubordination; but there are also elements of a glorious future.

In this new condition of things, what is the Church doing? Is she

taking care that the education of the conscience keeps pace with that of the mind and body? Standing as she does between officers and men, embracing them both, with authority and opportunity to speak to them both, has she not a special mission in this age of manifold changes when new developments of life and thought have to be met and turned into blessings?

(3.) The Short Service Act must cause a more rapid interchange between the civil and military members of the Church. Men come into the army for six years from our towns and villages, and then return to them again, carrying with them the good or the evil which has been sown or developed among us. I know how common it is to speak of all these influences as evil; I do not believe it. Men under the discipline of military life, are sometimes, and not so unfrequently as is generally imagined, influenced for good. I could point to many, once non commissioned officers, and private soldiers in the army, who are now the best possible helpers for clergymen in their parishes. I can thankfully say that in my present work, I am supported by most efficient unpaid lay helpers, and these men have been converted and built up in their most holy faith in the army. If the work of the Church prosper in the army, you will reap the benefit of it far more than we who have to sow the seed. If it is allowed to stagnate into mere formalism, and official coldness, so that earnest-minded religious men are driven to seek help heavenward in some religious body outside her, you must inevitably suffer, when these men return to their homes, lost to the Church, and you find them hinderers instead of helpers of the Church work.

I venture for these reasons to call this question of the Church in the Army a national question, worthy the attention of this Congress of the National Church.

I intend slightly to alter the terms of the subject, and to ask "what is the duty of the Church to the Army"? The answer to that question will tell us what Church work in the Army ought to be; simple facts shall shew us what it really is.

(1.) The primary duty is to see that the ministry which Jesus Christ has left for the edification of His Body is provided. This duty, I believe, is honestly fulfilled. Commissioned chaplains are placed at all the large stations of the army; at the smaller ones, officiating clergymen are paid by the State; so that in theory, every soldier has his chaplain.

The State does its best, theoretically, to provide fitting men. No chaplain can be finally appointed, without a six months' probation under some senior chaplain. The work is peculiar; it has its special dangers; its special requisites; it is, if I may say so, one long-continued Mission, for men are ever coming and going, so that you continually have to begin afresh in everything; it is a succession of new starts, needing no ordinary powers of body and mind. The ideal probation is, that some man of wide experience and large heart, who has learnt by loving sympathy with his brother men, above all by entering into the love of Jesus, the "Son of Man," the way to influence masses of men, the way to read the individual heart of a soldier, that is, of a man, should instruct his younger brother in the ministry, by imparting to him the secrets of his own experience, so enabling him to start from the vantage ground of his hard-won knowledge. This is the ideal. I do not deny that it sometimes

acts badly when translated into practice, but the fact of its existence is a testimony to our needs. We want, not only the authorised number of men as chaplains, but fitting men. Nothing should be allowed to take the place of that earnest, devoted, enthusiastic love for men's souls, as redeemed by the precious Blood of Christ, which alone can make us able ministers of the New Testament. We want chaplains, not merely to count in the Army List, but men having the spirit of "power and love, and of a sound mind," men who are "spurred at heart with fiercest energy;" men who shall be no "mere Sabbath-drawlers of old saws distilled from some worm-cankered homily," but proclaimers of a gospel in living words to wandering and weary souls; proclaimers also of God's righteous judgments against all selfishness, all indifference, all impurity, wherever it is found. So the Church's work will at least be carried on by fitting and prepared instruments.

It has long been felt that chaplains in the army were a kind of ecclesiastical outcasts. We have undoubtedly sometimes seemed to stand in an anomalous position; priests in an Episcopal Church, without Episcopal mission or guidance. But the remedy has always been in our own hands; we could ask the bishop of the diocese, in which we were serving, for his licence. This in my own case has always most readily and kindly been given. The late Bishop of Rochester, Bishop Wigram, interested himself much in our work at Chatham. For the help of the Bishop of Nova Scotia, I shall never cease to be thankful. Confirmation, administered every year in our own chapel, made us realise more than any words could do, what a bishop was in the Church of God, and now that years have passed by, I continually find memories of those solemn hours fresh in the souls of those who took part in them.

The real difficulties of an army chaplain do not arise from this supposed lack of mission; they spring mainly from the dual form of government, under which they are placed, the ecclesiastical and the military: there is much uncertainty where one begins and the other ends. They spring from the undefined positions of chaplains working together in the same garrison, sometimes in the same church; from the forgetfulness of some with whom we have to do that we are ministers of the Church, and then army chaplains; above all, they spring from the ever-continued changes in our congregations, in our Church workers both among officers and men.

In the Queen's Regulations we are expressly told that we are to regard those under our care in all respects as our parishioners. There, this principle is fully recognised—chaplains are in charge of souls, they have the cure of souls. As the parish priest is subject to the law, so are we. As the parish priest is bound to consult the wishes, the feelings, even the prejudices of his congregation, so are we. I should not have the slightest objection to something like parochial councils in the army. Personally, I do nothing without the assent of a congregational meeting. But within these limits, if Church work is to be really done in the army, we must be free to do the best we can for the honour and glory of God, and the salvation of men's souls. There are so many uncertainties, obstacles, and hindrances, that I venture most solemnly to say that no man without a clear unmistakable call from God should become an army chaplain. After fourteen years of most happy, and I believe, not useless work, meeting during that time, with but one exception, the most ungrudging

support, and the most generous sympathy from the generals with whom I have served, as well as from all classes of officers and men, I am constrained to say that, had I foreseen the difficulties of the work, and the dangers to my own soul, I should have hesitated long before I accepted it. A most awful temptation comes from time to time to every really earnest army chaplain: "Just do your routine work, you have been driven back so often, it is useless to attempt more." If sometimes chaplains do fall beneath the power of this subtle temptation, let no one cast a stone, before they know the experience through which they have passed.

(2.) The next duty of the Church is to see that the work of the ministry can be duly exercised, that the Word of God has free course; this is done—

(*a.*) By parade services.—Every soldier not on duty is bound to attend the public worship of Almighty God on Sunday mornings. He is perfectly free to belong to any body of Christians; he can change his religious denomination as often as he wishes; a more convenient hour or place often does much to determine the creed of the careless or indifferent; but to some place of public worship all must go.

In the divisional orders at Aldershot every Saturday, the following places are notified as those to which men will be marched on Sunday: Church of England, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Independent, United Presbyterian, and Baptists. So that there is perfect liberty of conscience. The Church of England has, as far as attendance at public worship is concerned, no vantage ground. These parade services are most striking sights. Whenever the men are brought to realise the blessing of taking their part in them, the hymns and canticles are sung with a vehemence and heartiness seldom surpassed. Again, parade services enable us to preach the gospel to every man under our care; this undoubtedly is a great advantage of army work, for "faith cometh by hearing." Several of the men come from a life into which the gospel of hope has never penetrated; it is something new for them to hear of the Father's love; while in other hearts old memories are freshened, and "new thoughts of God, new hopes of heaven" are often quickened. I do not believe that any agency can do so much to purify and educate our soldiers as this. Nothing can so bind together officers and men as a common worship; nothing can so teach them their duty as members one of another as the ordinances of the house of the Lord.

(*b.*) There were certain other regulations laid down for our guidance by the late Chaplain-General in 1865, in a W. O. circular. At that time these orders were a grand step in the right direction. Sunday evening voluntary services were ordered to be held; week-day services were recommended; hymns were to be used; the Holy Communion to be celebrated at least monthly, and on the great festivals. The voluntary services were to be rendered as attractive as possible. So an official sanction was given to voluntary work, and the Church owes much to Mr Gleig for this circular. The results have been correspondingly great. During the last ten years, voluntary Sunday evening services have taken quite a new place in Church work in the army. Many garrison churches are filled, some of them by a military congregation.

In all Church work in the army, it is necessary to bear in mind the

nature of the souls with whom we have to do. In days gone by it was often said that when a soldier became religious, really in earnest about his soul, he left the Church of England. Why was this? Because there was no recognition of the emotional, the subjective character of their spiritual life. The rigid rule of the Act of Uniformity was supposed to apply to all ministrations everywhere. The craving of the men for something less formal was ignored. If a man said, "I know in whom I have believed," it was considered presumptuous; if in the joy of that assurance he wished to speak of the blessings of forgiveness to others, it was called unchurchlike. A clergyman once said to me with astonishment, speaking of a pious soldier, "Why! he wanted to pray in my presence." Soldiers, on the other hand, have often said, "I thought that the Church of England never allowed a clergyman to preach without a book." In order to make such souls feel that the Church is their true home, and that Christ in her supplies their every need, we must use Bible-classes, Prayer-meetings, After-meetings, and personal intercourse, each in its proper place. The public worship of Almighty God in the army should be conducted with all due decorum, for no men are more influenced by externals than soldiers; but for edification, simple Bible-classes, for instruction, lectures on the Prayer-Book, for conversion After-meetings for pressing home the truth are necessary. In the army we cannot ignore the work of God, the Holy Ghost, as the Converter. Brought face to face with so many living without thought of God, prodigal children of the loving Father, we realise more, I think, than parish priests the need of that convincing Spirit, whose office it is to lead men back to the Father's house with the cry, "I will arise, and go to my Father, and will say to Him, Father, I have sinned." It has long seemed to me as I have looked at this need, that missions are peculiarly adapted for furthering God's work in the army. I do hope that under your Lordship's personal supervision some of our Mission Preachers, like Mr Wilkinson or Mr Body, may be induced and permitted to hold Missions in our church. I believe it will be your Lordship's high privilege to inaugurate such a work, and I know it will be your pleasure.

(3.) There still remains the duty of providing fitting places in which our soldiers may assemble for the worship of God. In some places this is fully done by consecrated churches, but in many other places unconsecrated buildings are used by the Church of England and Presbyterian troops, and sometimes by Roman Catholics as well. In this matter I am bound to say, the Church has failed in her duty to the army. Her work can never be satisfactorily carried on, until we have places solely set apart for our worship. Doubtless, it has been the pleasure of successive Secretaries of State for War to do all they felt the country would sustain them doing to remedy this acknowledged evil. Much has already been done in the way of improvement. At first chapel schools were used for all kinds of entertainments—the chancels were sometimes made green rooms, and the holy table a refreshment stall; but all this was peremptorily stopped. The buildings can now be used only for church and school. We are thankful for these past improvements; we do not doubt but that the present Secretary for War will go on with the work. Some facts shall shew the greatness of this need. There is at Aldershot a building used for Church of England and Presbyterian services. Last

year this was the Sunday order: 8 A.M., Holy Communion; 9 A.M., Presbyterian service; 10.15 A.M., Church of England service; 11.30 A.M., Presbyterian service. Now, in order that the building might be ventilated, it was rightly ordered that the church should be cleared 15 minutes between each service. The Holy Communion had thus to be over in 45 minutes. On four days in that year the number of communicants at the early services was 83, 71, 81, 80. Just think how such a service must be hurried, how many rubrics must be broken, how the devotions of all must be disturbed; yet it could not be otherwise. The parade service shows more strikingly the need. It commenced at 10.15, the church had to be cleared by 11.15, it takes at least 7 minutes for 900 persons to leave the church, so that the whole service, sermon and all, had to be finished in 53 minutes. On the fourth Sunday in each month, it had always been the custom to have a celebration of the Holy Communion at this parade service. Many married officers and soldiers' wives living at some distance could not attend the early celebration. On that Sunday then a parade service, sermon, and celebration of the Holy Communion, with from 40 to 50 communicants, had to be got through, I say deliberately, *got through* in 53 minutes. Can the work of the Church be so carried on? Soldiers feel this matter most deeply, and if this Church Congress would but take the matter up, and help the authorities by forming an outside public opinion to alter it, it would do a great work for the army. The expenditure of money must rest on the nation's will, but I venture to believe, that even financially it would be a real gain, for it would enable us to bring the influences of religion far more powerfully upon a soldier's life.

I have hitherto spoken of the direct work of the Church, but other things come within the scope of her duty. What is she doing with regard to the intemperance in the army? I have long been convinced that total abstinence is a necessity to many soldiers, but there always were two great difficulties in my way when I attempted to guide such a movement. (1.) There was no society to which we could ally ourselves in union with the Church: this is met now by the Church of England Temperance Society. (2.) The want of rooms in which to meet. It is not enough for a soldier to take the pledge. If you close the canteen, the public house with its music-hall, &c., you must open some other doors for him. Remember, he is taken away from his family, from his early friends; now in taking him from those places of wicked excitement where drink has been ruining him, you separate him from his so-called agreeable companions. Where is the man to go? What is he to do? You must give him some help to supply the lacking fellowship, to fill up the vacant hour. We have literally no place to which we Church of England chaplains can invite him, and meet with him in friendly intercourse, and thus show him that his Church has to do not only with his Sunday life; but with his everyday pursuits. The greatest want I know for carrying out Church work in the Army, is some place where Church of England soldiers may meet for companionship, for recreation, for Temperance meetings, Guild meetings, and the like; may meet too, if they will, for directly religious intercourse. We feel the need of such a place in many other ways. There is a Guild in the army for communicants; the members of it at Aldershot often wish to meet and consult about Church

work, so that by the mingling of powers, and co-operation of service, the work for Christ may be more efficiently done; but we have no place in which to meet.

So deeply is this want felt and recognised by others, that in Aldershot, at present, there have been three distinct attempts to supply it.

(1.) There is a Mission Hall built from subscriptions from people throughout England, thirteen years ago; I have no doubt but that is of use to many. I trust the service held in it may be the means of bringing some souls to Christ that we cannot touch. But in this building, distinctively Church of England meetings could not be held; it is undenominational; Church of England Temperance meetings, Church of England communicants' meetings; the meeting of chaplains of the Church of England with their flock form no part of its object.

(2.) and (3.) The Wesleyan body, feeling as we do the need of these indirect aids for men's good, have built two soldiers' homes in Aldershot. I look upon this fact as the greatest testimony to the special need of which I speak. If Wesleyans, with so few soldiers comparatively in Aldershot, find it necessary to have not only their chapels but soldiers' homes, how much more must we feel the need, with so many souls to care for. This view is not merely my own, it is that of every chaplain to whom I have spoken, and it is shared by hundreds of earnest men that have passed through our hands. This duty does not belong to the War Office; it is a duty which individual Churchmen alone can render. We lay the matter before the Church. We ask for the same aid that Wesleyans give to their soldiers. If you, my Lord, will take the matter up, the want will be supplied, for Aldershot has a claim upon all; well nigh every village in the land has its representatives there.

For the furtherance of the work of the Church in the Army, I plead with my whole heart; I know what soldiers are, I know their faults, their sins, their dangers, their temptations. Yet they are the most generous, the most sympathising of men. No case of distress is ever unheeded, no widow ever sent away without help from a barrack-room. I know, too, what soldiers may become through the influence of the Church's system upon their lives. There is a generosity, a devotion, a heartiness, a courage in a soldier's religion, if it does but take root in his heart, which shame us.

Love to the Church as the body of Christ, loyalty to the Church of England, self-sacrifice of time and money for the Master's work, thankfulness for the means of grace, "which strengthen and refresh their souls;" earnest prayer for the revival of God's work, lie very close to many a soldier's heart. Will not the Church help us to develop this good seed? In times of war you would let us plead in every parish for the soldier's comfort and the soldier's good. In this time of peace, which may God long continue, will not clergymen open their pulpits, and laymen their pockets, to enable us to build a Church of England Soldiers' Home in Aldershot?

ADDRESS.

Farrier-Major Terry, R.E.

As a soldier I am not much accustomed to speak—I feel sure you will excuse me if I should say anything out of place.

When I was asked to say a few words on behalf of Church work in the Army, I should most certainly have declined, but for one thing; I had made a promise that I would never lose an opportunity to speak a word for Christ and His Church, if such were afforded me. I was surprised to find the opportunity presented by this Congress. But after thinking over the matter and asking God to guide me, I accepted the opportunity.

I stand here then as a representative of my brother non-commissioned officers, and men of the army, who take a like interest in the Church with myself. I have now been nearly twenty years in the army, and have been more or less interested in Church work most part of that time. Religion was at the beginning of that time at a very low ebb, especially in the Church of England. There was in many places only one service, that was a parade service on Sunday morning, and nothing more all day. The Holy Communion was but seldom celebrated; the service was very cold; no responses or singing from the congregation, all the service was said by the clergyman and clerk or orderly. But it pleased Almighty God in His providence to stir up the hearts of some of His servants, to make His service more real. The camp of Aldershot at which I was then stationed was favoured by some of these. During the years 1861 and 1862, we began to do some work in real earnest; we formed Bible classes, Prayer-meetings, and a choir out of what we had: we had no regimental band. I well remember the instruments we first had to lead the choir: one was a flute, the other was a concertina, and by this means we tried our very best to make the service more hearty; we then planted ourselves in different parts of the church to respond. By this means we got up a good hearty service to the honour and glory of God, which from that time to this has never quite died out.

It was felt that there was wanted a closer union between the members of our Church. A society was then formed, called the Church of England Union; this society worked well, and many happy hours its members spent in considering the best means to make the worship of Almighty God more hearty and acceptable to Him, and to bring our comrades under the influence of the Word of God.

All who take part in the work of the Church in the Army must be really in earnest: first, because the work is a very difficult one; second, because there are so many changes taking place from time to time; the chaplain is taken from his men, the men are taken away from the chaplain. The work requires faith, patience, and courage; it is because these three things have been wanting, that so little has been done toward bringing more of our comrades to the Lord Jesus. We want chaplains to lead us, who know in Whom they have believed, who are in earnest. Soldiers very quickly make up their minds about their ministers; perhaps we expect too much of them; but nowhere are clergymen discussed more than in a barrack-room, and nowhere are worthy men more respected. If chaplains are earnest for the cause of Christ they will find before many years men in almost every garrison, both at home and abroad, who will be willing to assist them in their work, men who delight in the service of their Saviour, and who will live and die in the faith of Christ crucified.

Chaplains cannot do all the work themselves, they want help. I have seen the difference between those whose earnestness and love gained this assistance and those who had none; the latter would have from 5 to 12 people at a voluntary service, while the former would have from 500 to 1000. I have seen the same difference in proportion at Holy Communion. During the early years of my soldiery, I but seldom saw any soldier at the table of the Lord: I have often been alone from the ranks, and with very few other people. Yes, in a church that would in days gone by have had certainly not more at the celebration than thirty communicants on Easter Day, they have now one hundred and eighty, so that there has been a fresh advance, for which we are heartily thankful.

Now what is the reason of this great difference? I will tell you; it is prayer: prayer will climb the ladder Jacob saw, it will stop the mouths of lions, it will move mountains, in fact, it will do everything if asked in faith; one thing I am sure it will do, it will fill our churches, and send the Word of God when it is preached home to souls. If you want a proof of this, just come to Aldershot camp and take a peep inside our church on any Sunday evening, and I am sure you will say they are in real earnest.

Yes, God means us to be in earnest to do His work for Him.

Jesus was in real earnest when He carried that cross to Calvary, and hung upon it, and bore the sins of the whole world; and so must we His followers be, if we would carry on His work.

In 1873, a society was formed called the Guild of the Holy Standard. The object of this society is to promote religion in the army, by teaching obedience to the Church, and by inculcating that the fear of their comrades, which so often deters men who are religiously disposed, from an outward profession of their faith, is cowardice and unworthy of a soldier. This guild is intended to provide an organisation for the whole British army at home and abroad, similar to the Aldershot Union, which of course was local. It is said union is strength, and it is strength we want, to carry on Christ's work in the army. This society now I believe numbers over 300 members. Just think of 300 prayers going up as a memorial before God, every morning and evening, all for the same object, and all doing something for God; helping in churches, and in the Sunday school; some one thing and some another; all striving to forward Christ's work in bringing wanderers into His fold. Surely this work is of God. Nothing is so much needed at Aldershot as a kind of meeting place for the members of the Church of England; other denominations have their halls and places to meet in, but we have nothing of the sort; we have nothing but the church to do all our work; even that is not our own to do what we wish in. Will some rich layman (perhaps there may be some here to-night help us in this work for the love of God? We are too poor to do it of ourselves.

I have been now over eighteen years a total abstainer, and I feel sure that it is the only chance for many a man. It has made me feel sad at heart many a time, to see my brother non-commissioned officer reduced to the ranks for drunkenness. We do want very badly something of that sort. The Church of England Temperance Society has a branch in the army, and if we only had a Church of England Guild Hall at Aldershot, it would be a great thing for the Temperance cause. But, above all, we long to see the time come when we shall have churches all to ourselves, not one shared as at present by other denominations. We want, I say, a church where we can worship God under our own vine and fig-tree, none daring to make us afraid.

We are most thankful for the much that has been done for the comfort of the soldier of late years; but I am sure a step in the direction of giving us churches

to worship God in by ourselves, and places to hold meetings in, would tend to make the members of the Church of England more devoted to that Church, which teaches them not only to fear God but to honour the king, which can make them better than anything (I believe) good soldiers of England, as well as loyal servants of Jesus Christ.

DISCUSSION.

Captain G. E. Wyndham Malet, R.H.A.

Previous speakers have alluded to the different terms of enlistment which of recent days have been ordered in the service of the army. I think it is due to the Short Service Act that a greater feeling of sympathy between the civil and military population of England has sprung up, and it is to this feeling of sympathy that we must attribute the interest felt in a discussion on the Church in the Army by a Church Congress, held at a place like Stoke-on-Trent, which is neither a military centre nor a garrison town. This more intimate connection between soldiers and civilians will of course be further developed by the operations of the Short Service Act, as the stream from military to civil life flows on; but I think we want at the same time an extension of the military school system, or some kind of arrangement by which boys could be passed into the service on leaving school at an early age, eventually to be absorbed into the ranks without settling down to trades in civil life. It has been said that there are few communicants in the army. That such is the case no one can deny, and there are many reasons for it. One is a false feeling of shame to confess Christ before men, and this is engendered by the publicity of barrack life. A man is afraid to kneel down in a barrack room and say his prayers, when there are thirty or forty men in the room. And men are afraid to stay in a barrack church for Holy Communion when their comrades are staring at them as if they were criminals. Then attendance at church is compulsory. When a soldier enlists he is asked what his religion is; whatever denomination he professes to belong to, he is provided for; probably he speaks from conviction; or as the result of his education; or it may be from sheer carelessness. If he is nothing at all, he goes on the roll as a member of the Church of England. Now that I think is a faulty system. I once heard of a recruit who was enlisted at Aldershot, and was asked the usual question, and he said, "I have not made up my mind." Probably he had a vague notion of getting off church parade, but the officer was level with him. He turned round to the sergeant and said, "This recruit has not made up his mind as to what religion he professes. We will give him every opportunity. Every Sunday morning he will go with the Roman Catholics to the 7.45 service, to the Church of England service at 9.15; and with the Presbyterians at 11." The man soon found out that he was an attached member of the Church of England, probably because it was the shortest service of the three. Let me tell you another story which was once related to me. An officer of a regiment in India was astonished to observe the number of perversions to the Church of Rome in his regiment; and it was the more embarrassing because there was no Roman Catholic chaplain in the station. He thought it was a pity that these perverts should stop in their rooms whilst the other men were attending divine service. So he ordered them to go to drill whilst the other men were at church, and the exodus to Rome received a sudden check. It is well known, then, that church parade is generally disliked; the service is too often heartless and formal, and by many men is looked upon as an irksome duty. I think we might try the voluntary system instead of the compulsory in church parade. There is something very repulsive to my mind in the idea of a man being compelled to go to church whether he wishes it or not. It has been done away with amongst civilians, and I do not see why it should not be done away with in the

army. Or we might try a modification of the present system by letting soldiers go to church independently, in time for the commencement of divine service; and by letting them parade when they come out of church after service is over. There would be one great advantage in this plan—viz., that the men would not come to church tired, cold (or hot as the case may be), perhaps wet, as they often do now that they turn out for church parade perhaps three-quarters of an hour before the service commences, to which I attribute the coughing, sneezing, &c., which seems inseparable from a military church service. At any rate, whatever we do, compulsory parade services can never be looked upon as anything but secondary, considered as a means of making soldiers more religious. Seed cannot grow upon a well-frequented turnpike road; and if the chaplains cannot in this way grapple with the infidelity and vice in the army, they must break up the soil in other ways. We want mission services, Bible classes, voluntary services in the evening, celebrations of the Holy Communion at such an hour in the morning as would enable men to attend, without interfering with their military duties, and without subjecting them to the temptation to go away, arising from the celebration after morning service to which I have before alluded. I think also that we should consider the best hours for the voluntary service in the evening on Sundays and week-days. We ought not to have a time selected for the evening services on purpose to suit the officers and their wives who want to get back to their dinner at 7.30, but to suit the non-commissioned officers and men, the bulk of their parishioners. I am quite aware that a great deal of credit is due to chaplains in the army in general, but I must say I should like to see some of them pay a little more attention to barrack visiting and less to calling on Mrs This and Mrs That. I should like to see all army chaplains visit the soldiers in the barracks just as much as the parish priest visits the members of his flock in a village. Another reason which militates against the cause of the Church in the army is the chapel-school system. The chapel-school is a great big oblong room about the size of this hall. On each side are three or four rows of seats, one rising above the other up to the back. These seats are attached to ordinary school desks. In the centre is an open space used as a promenade for teachers during school hours, and on Sunday it is filled with ricketty forms which sometimes tumble down with the men upon them. It is utterly impossible that the men can kneel down: they cannot even stand without difficulty on the sides where the desks are fixed. Now I think it ought to be laid down as a minimum in the construction of places of divine worship for soldiers that they should be able to kneel down for prayer, to stand up for praise, and to sit during the sermon just as comfortably as they do in their own parish church. Therefore, I say, in the first place, that these buildings are a great mistake regarded as chapels; I will add that they are a great mistake as regards schools, because they are very much too big. I dislike also the system of having plenty of room, nice seats, cushions, and kneelers provided for the officers, when the men have the miserable accommodation I complain of. I should like to see such distinctions swept away. Lastly, I do not think that we have half enough chaplains for the Church of England in the army. I know several chaplains who have two chapels to attend to, and some who have three in addition to the services at the hospitals, and adult and infant religious instruction and other parochial work. It is impossible for them to carry out their duties in a manner satisfactory to themselves and their congregation in such circumstances. That would not be tolerated in a parish, and I do not think it ought to be tolerated in the army. It is my earnest wish, and that of all who have the welfare of soldiers at heart, to call attention to these matters. Religion is the handmaid of discipline, and discipline is the way by which our armies are governed. The better the Christian, the better the soldier. A gentleman who sat next to me at breakfast this morning said, "What! *though* you are an officer, you take an interest in Church matters?" "Yes," I said; "*because* I am an officer, I take an interest in Church matters." If we can get some of these improvements carried out, we may look forward to greater improvements in the moral and spiritual condition of the soldier, and to increased zeal and earnestness in the Church in the army, to the greater glory of God.

The Rev. William Caine.

For many years I have taken an interest in mission work among soldiers, and at the request of a very good lady, Mrs Daniels, some years ago I went down to Aldershot to address the soldiers in her Mission Room. I was somewhat surprised to hear there was no Church of England Mission Room in Aldershot. I thought Mrs Daniels was connected with the Church of England, as she invited me and other clergymen to speak to the soldiers. I had before me in the Mission Room about eighty or one hundred soldiers. Certainly it was one of the most interesting meetings which I ever attended. I stayed all night in Aldershot, and met with some very pious officers, amongst whom was Major Puget. He was labouring at that time, together with Mrs Daniels, for the benefit of the soldiers. Soon after that I became the chaplain of a prison, and, to my great sorrow, I had many soldiers under my care. I may, perhaps, be permitted to quote a few lines from my Prison Report of the last year that I was chaplain. Speaking of the causes of crime, I said :—"There are three other causes of crime which I must not pass over—namely, the training of the militia, the existence of barracks for soldiers in our district, and the holding of wakes." Two of those have reference to the subject before us this evening—the training of the militia and the existence of barracks for soldiers. These, I am sorry to say, are fruitful in the production of drunkenness and prostitution. I have been very much pleased to hear from Farrier-Major Terry that he himself is a total abstainer, and that there are Temperance societies established in the army. At one time, I believe, the Duke of Wellington forbade the existence of Temperance societies in the army, and now the Duke of Cambridge sanctions them. That is a very great advantage. We ought to remove the stumbling-blocks out of the way of the progress of the Gospel in the army, and I should like to call the attention of the Lord-Bishop, who is now the chaplain-general of the army, to one of them—the billeting of soldiers in public houses. I think that ought to be prohibited by law, because the soldiers cannot resist the temptations to which they are exposed while they are billeted in public houses. Of course we all know that many of these soldiers are caught and entrapped when they are drunk. That ought not to be the case in a Christian land. There is another subject respecting which I should like to say a few words—namely, the very delicate duty of military chaplains in speaking to soldiers the whole truth about sin. I have met with chaplains who have said that they could not speak as they wished to do about the seventh commandment, in its full meaning, to the soldiers. Allow me in this place to say, that I think the Contagious Diseases Acts are a disgrace to a Christian country. More soldiers ought to be permitted to marry, and I trust that the chaplain-general, whom we have the honour to see in the chair this evening, will encourage, to the utmost of his power, teetotal societies in the army, as they would produce a great diminution in the sin and vice which we are always so strongly protesting against in connection with our army and navy.

The Rev. G. T. Carruthers.

As a chaplain in India, I should like to say a few words. The 60,000 or 70,000 soldiers we have there are subjected to many temptations which they have not here. We, as chaplains, may have great ideas as to what the army ought to be and what it ought not to be. We may think that more men ought to be married, and that

certain Acts of Parliament are not very proper. I am convinced from what I have seen in India, that the special Act alluded to by the previous speaker has been of the greatest benefit to the British soldier; and as regards marriage, we all know the necessities of State compel us to have a number of young men to fight for the country, and we must take things as they are and do the best we can. Now, the British soldier is exactly like any other man; he may be good or bad. But you have to deal with a thousand or two thousand young men, as we have sometimes on our stations in India, who are chosen not for their quiet plodding ways, but because they have got a little dash and spirit in them; because they desire the glory and excitement of war, and are more content to walk about the world than sit down to a trade; therefore you have a thousand or more young men of spirit to deal with. The question before us is, What are Churchmen to do? What are chaplains to do to win the confidence of these men and turn their thoughts more to God? I believe that the first real true work, and that which has most effect upon the men in a regiment, is the chaplain's attention to the sick. They feel very much any neglect of a poor sick man lying on his deathbed. They require especially that the chaplain shall be diligent there; that he shall try to lead men to God, and to be sorry for their sins. I believe a chaplain who is regular in going to the sickbed will very soon win the affections of his people. Then, secondly, there is in the army an element of married people. I think a chaplain's duty is very much amongst the married soldiers' wives and children. Soldiers like seeing a chaplain taking an interest in little children in the regiment. They like to know that the chaplain goes to the school, looks after the schoolmaster, sees that there is no injustice or tyranny, and that the children are getting on as well as they can. The people believe that it is the duty of the chaplain to go very much among the married soldiers, and try to keep them at all events in the paths of virtue, and do what he can to make the wives and children of soldiers patterns of all that is good. Then we come to the general life of the regiment. We cannot expect that a thousand young men should have all the sobriety and primness of ordinary people, and therefore we must try as much as we can to develop in the men of the regiment a real humble trust in Almighty God, and a proper desire to go to God for pardon and forgiveness of sin. We must have our voluntary services, our Bible classes, and so on; but the chaplain should in every way try and make himself the friend of the soldier: he should go to the barracks to visit them. I know this is often a very difficult matter. Sometimes the chaplain is not wanted there: but he should go when he has an opportunity; when a child or a man in the company has died, and so leave an impression for good. I know that a chaplain's duty in many respects is very difficult, but it is nevertheless one of the most blessed works in which a Christian man can be engaged.

The Rev. R. Rhodes Bristow, M.A., Vicar of St Stephen's, Lewisham, Kent.

Although there may be many disadvantages in connection with compulsory attendance at parade services, still there are some advantages. I received this summer an invitation from the National Artillery Association to act as chaplain at Shoeburyness, and on the second Sunday I was there, after the short service, an officer told me that one of the soldiers wished to speak to me. I went, and found a stalwart middle-aged man who was very much moved. I took him aside, and we talked

together. He told me he had been for many years in the army as a bandsman, and that during that time he had had a great deal to do with the arrangements for Divine service, but when he left the army he determined that he would never enter a church again. I asked him why, and he said he had seen so much that was unreal in his intercourse with the chaplains, that he did not care to have anything more to do with the clergy. He had come to this artillery camp on special duty; he said he tried to get off that portion of the duty which compelled him to attend church, but could not, and he added, "I thank God I came, because what I have heard to-day, has induced me to register a vow that not a Lord's day shall pass again without my being in the Lord's house." I have every reason to believe that the result of that man being compelled to attend divine service has been of the most beneficial character. Therefore I hope that it will not be forgotten that there may be compensating advantages connected with the practice of compulsory attendance at divine service.

THURSDAY MORNING, 7th OCTOBER.

The President took the Chair at a Quarter-past Ten.

LAY AGENCY AND OTHER REQUISITES FOR THE WORK OF THE CHURCH IN CROWDED CENTRES OF POPULATION.

PAPERS.

The Rev. P. Marshall, D.D., Rector of St John Baptist, Hulme.

In the British Association, presidents of sections were recently told that at the Annual Meeting they are to report "what is *new* in their respective departments." I trust, my Lord, the Church Congress is less exacting. I hardly think anything *new* could be said on the well-worn topic of lay agency, even had the committee resorted to that stimulant of the classic sybarite, who is said to have offered a *reward* to the discoverer of a *new* pleasure. Yet the complaint is still made of the difficulty of getting lay help. I find one from a clergyman, in the papers of the morning on which I write these lines. Nor do I think that the obtaining of lay help is the real difficulty. It is different here, I apprehend, from that which holds in the well-known instructions to the cook—"first to catch her hare." Here I believe the difficulty is not so much the catching as the cooking of the hare. Lay help, in its widest sense, is not so difficult to get as it is effectively to use and vigorously to sustain. I assume, however, different kinds of such agency have perhaps different difficulties. The writer of the letter I have quoted emphasises the word "gentlemen," as if the agency of ladies, or of the poor, were to be had *more* easily. But, anyhow, we may assume that lay agency in the work of the Church is neither so fully nor so efficiently in use, as it might be and needs to be. And if so, then there must be a cause, and I trust a

remedy. And if there be blame, then wise has been the action of the committee in bracketting a cleric and a laic together this morning; so that, having before you, according to Æsop, the sculpture after the conception of the man, you may then have an opportunity of contemplating the same subject as treated in the art language of the lion. Now, in answering the question how these respective difficulties are to be overcome, and lay help best obtained and sustained, I believe the first step is to settle what a layman is, and it does not seem to be quite agreed upon.

In the letter referred to there is reference to an accusation sometimes made of jealousy on the part of the clergy, lest the laity should encroach on *their* functions. I find also in a debate in Convocation, Canon Miller deprecating "a custom gradually growing up in the Church, of allowing laymen to read portions of the service which were not suitable to be read *by* laymen in public worship;" and in the name of a committee, he expresses a wish "to stop such an irregularity, which," he adds, "unless something be done, might ultimately extend to the most sacred parts of the service." * I know not to which parts reference is made; but I think it fundamental in this inquiry to assert that a layman is all that we priests are, save and excepting that which we are by virtue of our ordination, viz., gifted with powers commonly called sacerdotal. What these are is defined in our ordinal, as "the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," and this is explained as the remitting and retaining of sins, and the dispensing of the Word and sacraments," *i.e.*, absolution, benediction, consecration. These are reserved to the priesthood; but for all else *in* the Church or *out* of the Church, there is no reason—*i.e.*, no essential reason—why a layman should not officiate. Of course, as a matter of order and organisation, it will always be, and right for it to be, that the priest will be the prominent officiant; but all the same, and especially in these times, where there is increasing work for clergy, and daily a greater difficulty of supply, it should be insisted upon, how much of the work is within lay compass. The layman baptizes on emergency, the captain reads the burial service at sea, or the officer at his brother officer's grave. In our colonial churches laymen take matins, and evensong, of course without the absolution; and even where there is not the difficulty of no priest at hand, I can hardly see why a layman should not officiate frequently. I heard a layman sing the Litany the other day with a beauty of voice and power that can of course belong only to the few, and where such a gift is available, it is difficult to see why it should not be used, and why the service should be less perfectly offered by an unmusical priest, simply because he is a priest. And yet you are well aware that, judging from our practice, English Churchmen grow up with the idea that the only part possible for a layman in the public service is the reading of the Lessons, and even this is still exceptional in practice. In most of things I deem it a thoroughly sound principle, never to do anything myself that I can make a layman do for me. I have found it answer, and I trust that instead of any restrictions, such as suggested by Canon Miller, revision will proceed in a different direction; for I believe a right recognition of the wide area within which lay help is available, is the first true step towards eliciting it.

And the second step is of similar importance, viz., the proposal and the reiteration of the right motive for giving lay help in the work of the

London Guardian, July 14, 1875.

Church, which is, that God has a right to and makes a claim upon His people for this help; it is a solemn duty, a sacred responsibility. And I do not mean that this is to be appealed to as *a* motive, but as *the* motive, not only to be appealed to in things distinctly spiritual, or in things markedly prominent, but in all things. If a schoolboy is asked to carry home a Lent paper, and to invite his father to church, I should have him to learn and to feel that he is not merely going a message, and carrying a letter, but that he is doing a distinct work for God, that he is a lay agent in the Church's work. And I do trust I shall not be thought to be elaborating a platitude in insisting upon this. For I see, or fancy I see, so much imperfect motive appealed to in securing lay help; motives which are not wrong, and not always harmful, but yet which are imperfect: choir treats, *e.g.*, as a motive of choir service; the excitement and worldliness of a bazaar as a motive of work for Church funds: neither wrong; but if lay help worth having is to be got and relied on, these and kindred motives require constant balance and adjustment from a reiteration of the one only motive—the motive which is alone the right one. Imperfect *motives* may *secure* lay help, they will never *sustain* it; and when I see a great rush of enthusiasm in the beginning of a work, and I hear no high motive appealed to, it requires slight prescience to predict the result. So that I place in the forefront of the means for obtaining, and much more sustaining, lay help, the constant appeal to the one only motive, that God requires it at the layman's hand. I have in my experience found *giving*, *e.g.*, increased by often saying—Don't give if you do it not willingly, heartily, and as a duty.

Having thus defined the area, and proposed the only lasting motive, the next principle I suggest is reality in securing and sustaining lay help; it is essential the work should be real; whatever a layman is asked to do should be a reality. Digging holes and filling them up again, as we have sometimes read of being a test of pauper labour, is ever trying, always unfruitful, and must be deterrent. Now, how many of my brethren of the clergy in crowded centres have felt, I should like to ask, their Easter vestry a *reality?* Is it not often the parson, perhaps his curate and the verger, with the old wardens, and this to represent the interest of 4000 or 5000 people in an important Church office, at a time when the interest of the laity in the Church is confessedly real and intense. And why is it so? Because I hold the parish, *as the unit of Church management*, has *ceased* to be a reality; observe, I say, as a unit of Church management, not as an area of Church responsibility and a field of Church work. Let the electors be, *e.g.*, the communicants of the congregation, and, *experto crede*, a change will come over the spirit of the dream.

Or again, in another part of the work, if you give a couple of young women a bundle of tracts, as I have seen, and send them round on a Sunday afternoon to collect the previous week's, and distribute these, and the good woman of some house brings out three or four other tracts—a Baptist, a Wesleyan, and an Independent tract—and asks, as I have known it to be the case, "Which is yours?" it is soon impressed even on the densest of tract-lending intellects, that tracts thus sown broad-cast are rarely if ever read; that the work is therefore an *unreality:* digging a hole one Sunday and filling it up the next, and the *lay agent's* zeal is apt to cool and very likely to be lost to the Church's work; because the work given it to do

was a manifest unreality. How many times names stand on committees on which they never act! and that is, *pro tanto*, an unreality.

If the area be defined, the motive true, and the work real, the next head I mention is *organisation*. May I venture to describe briefly that which exists in my own parish. We call it "The Church Society," of which I am *ex officio* president. It consists of lay communicants of both sexes, and is made up of any number of branches—at present sixteen—as *e.g.*, guilds of men, women, boys and girls; "a penny bank branch," a "decoration branch," an "altar server's branch," and so forth. Each branch manages its own affairs, and the whole is kept in hand by a council consisting of a president, vice-presidents (who are the prominent laymen of the communicants), and one representative of each branch. We first realise the principle I have put forth as fundamental, viz., the true motive of work, by resting upon a devotional basis. There is a Daily Collect to be said for the work by the members; we communicate together with mutual intercession at an early celebration on the great festivals, and at St John Baptist Tide—being the saint of our dedication. We further endeavour to realise what I have suggested as also a primary head, viz., *reality*, by having a half-yearly meeting at which the secretary of each branch reads a report of the work done by his branch during the past six months: and this I consider a very essential part of the organisation. We recognise secondary motives by coupling the January reports with a tea party, and a festal evensong. The reports are then printed and circulated among the communicants. The *reality* of the organisation is a subject which I have constantly in my thoughts, and on which I am constantly holding forth, inculcating the duty of constant revision of the members of branches, cutting off the lame and the lazy, re-organising and re-constructing; an analogy for which is to be found in the organisation of nature, where with a type unchangeable, there goes on a perpetual flux of the parts. All such organisations are only rightly regarded not as buildings put up once for all, but delicate living things requiring the utmost care for their healthy life. Moreover, we recognise the other of these fundamental principles, viz., the width of area over which lay help may range by the rule that any three or more laics, men or women, may form a branch to do anything they may deem a work for the Church, draw up rules, and with the revision of these by the council commence operations. In this I hold the more absolute freedom the better. I remember Dr Hook, at a Church Congress many years ago, saying, that if a layman *was anxious* to help, you might be quite sure he had some theory of his own to work out; and I say why should he not? Two heads are proverbially better than one; and, I believe, the only condition upon which lay agency is to be had and used with all its fulness, is by recognising that the layman is one of the two heads and not merely a tail. The best help is only to be had on this condition, of the utmost and most perfect freedom, consistent of course with the organisation of which it forms a part. An organisation has recently been before the country, which I think illustrates my meaning. I mean the so-called St Alban's Working Men's Committee. It is not necessary for me to either approve or disapprove of their object. But I do think it most important to recognise in it the entire freedom with which laymen may act in the defence of what they deem the well-being of their Church; and when that freedom is clearly

recognised, it is wondrous how much it adds to lay energy. The whole organisation is lay, and so much does it touch the lay heart, that I am told they have already nearly ninety sympathetic, corresponding organisations in large towns and parishes—a result, I venture to think, which would hardly have followed had it emanated from or been initiated by clerical agency.

And lastly, I wish to note that with the right motive and the right area, and the right organisation of *lay* work, there is one line of work, which, as it is the most important, so it is the most difficult to get. Church work is very varied. It lies as it were in concentric circles. In the outer circle comes such work as that of a Church Building committee, the management of the penny bank, or clothing club, and such like. Within this *quasi*-secular work lies a region of spiritual work, such as helping to gather in the flock; helping to teach them when gathered in, in schools, at mothers' meetings, &c.; while within this again lies the distinctly spiritual work of dealing with souls, one by one. This is the very innermost circle of all Church work. It is the most powerful influence of all—the alone lasting one—individual contact of soul with soul. The work graduates in difficulty from the outer to the inner circle. For one person that can be got ready to speak, and capable of speaking, *e.g.*, to a lad about his spiritual life, or of helping lovingly a wayward girl, trying but often failing to do right, it is easy to get half-a-dozen ready and capable of teaching in school, or reading at a mothers' meeting, and any number who will distribute alms, or Church notices, or manage tea-parties, or arrange a congregational excursion. I have over fifty streets in my parish, and I have no difficulty at a Mission time, *e.g.*, in getting a communicant visitor for every street. But I have seldom been able to get even school teachers to get into the habit of speaking occasionally to their pupil teachers about their souls. It *is* difficult—we priests feel it is so much easier to say the bright "good morning," inquire after the little ones, and chuck baby under the chin, than to come to the real point of all pastoral intercourse; yet these are after all only parallels of approach (and happy he who can make them most naturally), but only of any use if we get to the citadel of the individual soul at last. And I deem it of equal importance with complete organisation, that there should be co-ordinately going on a training in the sense of each man's individual responsibility for his brother, by getting him to work outside any organisation. To take one example; by picking out those of one's confirmation candidates, whom we are sure of, and suggesting to here one, and there one, to look after some other, of whose steadiness we have not an equal hope, most naturally a neighbour or a classfellow walking the same way to church, or crossing the path in some other way. For one child of God to be thus set working and caring for another child of God, is to elicit lay help of the very truest kind which must spring from the highest motive, which extends over the widest area, and blesses both him who gives and him who takes.

Mr Lewis Samson.

If a visitor to the present Church Congress were to be taken to one of the manufactories for which this town is famous, and it were told him, "The wheels stand idle for want of throwers," the seggars are empty, for although there are plenty of articles in the green state, there are no hands to fill them. There are patterns to be impressed upon the porous biscuit, but there is a lack of "transferrers;" would he not loudly express his regret that whilst there was all the machinery requisite for the production of articles of use and beauty, everything should be brought to a standstill for want of hands?

And yet this is, as it appears to me, no inapt illustration of what is occurring in the Church at the present moment.

Ask the incumbents of the mother city and her seemingly prosperous daughters, and what will you hear? They will tell you of the various agencies which exist, but which are paralysed for want of employés; and they will also tell you of narrow alleys and stifling courts, whose inhabitants are never visited as they should be, for the excellent reason that people have not hitherto seen that it is their duty to include them amongst their visiting acquaintances.

And as it is necessary to know the cause of a complaint before attempting its cure, let us inquire what it is in the case of London.

Well, one cause, I suppose, is thoughtlessness. It does not strike people that a little acquaintance with the domestic surroundings of those who are pressing bouquets and books of the opera against their carriage windows might be for their mutual benefit; neither does it occur to them that the spangles on Harlequin's dress could tell a tale of poverty and toil of which they never dream.

Then there's selfishness. So few, like Macready, prefer to set up a night-school instead of a carriage and pair.

Some again may plead ignorance. If this be so, let them cross Hyde Park some summer's afternoon, and as they listen to the preaching of earnest men, interrupted by the taunts and jeers of those who are only restrained from actual violence by the presence of the police, it may occur to them that there still remains work for the laity, nobler even than the contemplation of monkeys at the Zoological, more bracing than the breezes of Maidenhead and Richmond.

Or if they desire proof of another kind, I would draw their attention to a statement which appears in a recent report of a Mission in St Giles's, that "three out of four were baptized as adults on the Sunday before they were presented to the Bishop for Confirmation." And I would refer them to the last report of Queen Charlotte's Lying-In Hospital, where they will find it stated that "at the lowest computation in London alone, not less than 30,000 illegitimate children are born yearly." Horrible thought! The Albert Hall of Arts and Sciences filled three times over with the product of godlessness and lust!

Again, fear may deter some people from doing much useful work in crowded centres of population; and it may encourage such to hear the testimony of a missioner in St Giles's during the London Mission of last year: "Not only did most of those who had been brought up in our Church receive us well, but also many Dissenters and Romanists."

As national morality is made up of domestic morality, so must the Church prosper best in that parish in which the laity lighten as much as possible the labours of the clergyman, leaving him time for organisation, and affording opportunities for the recovery of "power in the higher departments of thought by theology and theologians." It will be well, therefore, to consider how this may be effected socially and personally.

Of the former. The laity may greatly further the Church's work by bearing in mind St Francis of Sales's precept, and "joining the exterior care of their households with the interior care of their souls," by affording their servants every facility for obeying the Church's call, by encouraging thrift, providing them with wholesome food for the mind (George Herbert's lines about sweeping a room might be illuminated and suspended in some convenient place), and inculcating in them such principles as will prove a blessing when they have homes of their own.

Employers of labour may do the Church good service by regarding those in their employ as something better than machines, and showing a wholesome interest in their home concerns. Whilst in the case of large establishments, the work of the Church would be greatly furthered by the services of a chaplain residing on the spot, and whose house might be arranged for the accommodation of many of the operatives. Frequent opportunities might thus be afforded for attending classes for religious instruction, and arrangements might be made, enabling the chaplain to hold services on special occasions at the nearest church, notices of such services being duly posted up in the establishment. In addition to these duties the chaplain would prepare candidates for Confirmation, and if the heads of the establishment would show their interest in the spiritual welfare of those committed to their care by being present at that ceremony, and the subsequent first communion, so much the better for the prosperity of the Church, whilst they could not furnish a more substantial proof of their loyalty, than by imitating a recent example at the East End of London, and contributing largely towards providing her with a local habitation in the quarter whence they draw their supplies.

It has been suggested by the late Vicar of Doncaster, that it would be well if the spiritual needs of club servants were considered as well as the bodily requirements of the members; and assuredly it seems as rational to afford them facilities for attaining everlasting happiness, as to provide them with the pleasures of the cricket-field, and the delights of a Christmas ball.

Again, what work for the Church might be done by the owners of houses in crowded centres of population, if landlords would improve the properties entrusted to their care, look after them sometimes themselves, try to induce the tenants to imitate their own domestic arrangements, and enter into such agreements with them as would promote temperance, and the keeping of the seventh commandment, and thus forward instead of hinder the work of God's ambassadors.

Of personal services which laymen may render the Church, not the least valuable will be those of acting as treasurers of and beggars for parochial charities; as trainers of Church choirs, as stewards of workmen's clubs, where the presence of an educated and refined mind will often be extremely valuable; as instructors of glee clubs, useful not only as fostering a love for music in the members themselves, and proving that the Church now,

as in the past, can be the home for art, but also as furnishing a means of providing the neighbourhood with a counter-attraction to the music hall; as vice-presidents of societies for developing "the art of holy living," whether called guilds or unions, it matters not, so long as the mutual improvement and encouragement of the members is the object proposed; as superintendents of boys' institutes (I know of one started recently in a cellar near Drury Lane Theatre, where the promoter has attended nightly from seven till ten, whose example may encourage others to indulge themselves in the luxury of doing good). Laymen may also do good work by holding evening Bible classes for youths and adults, as well as by conducting prayer meetings; because with regard to the latter, however desirous one may be for united worship in consecrated buildings, it is impossible to conceal from one's self the fact, that there are many who cannot yet appreciate our Church's services, and who must therefore be fed with milk instead of strong meat. It would, I think, be well when possible, to select for this duty persons endowed with good voices, for a psalm may sometimes reach a soul when a sermon will not.

But the richest banquet is spread to no purpose unless there be guests to partake of it. And here we are confronted with the grave question, "How are the guests to be induced to come?" Chiefly, I think, by personal invitation delivered at their own homes. Indeed, I believe the visitation of the poor at their own homes, to be one of the greatest requisites for the work of the Church, in crowded centres of population. It is, I think, impossible to overrate the immense amount of good which may result from frequent personal intercourse with a judicious district visitor. The presence of such an one will, I believe, frequently exert an influence as potent as that of her of whom it is written—

> "She sent the deathless passion in her eyes
> Through him, and made him hers, and laid her mind
> On him, and he believed in her belief."

It is, I think, in the power of the educated laity to exert an influence for good over their poorer brethren, quite as valuable as that which Mr Bright trusts may result from the visit of the Prince of Wales to "that great people over whom at some distant day it will be his great fortune and his tremendous responsibility to rule;" and that they no less than he "may leave behind memories that may be of exceeding value, and that may be equal in their influence to the greatest measures of state policy that the government could propound."

But then district visitors must possess tact and common sense. An injudicious enthusiast will do more harm than good, and simply be regarded as fair game for "besting." And yet how difficult it is to induce people to visit the poor at their homes. If it were a question of the success of a candidate for Parliament, or a school board, there would be plenty of canvassers, but as it is only one of saving souls, the clergy must take what assistance they can get, and only be too thankful for that. It is, I think, well, whenever possible, to make arrangements for women to visit by day, and men in the evening. The latter will often thus get an opportunity of saying a few words to the "bread-winners" (or masters, as the case may be), which they won't at another time; and if the visited happens to be an intelligent man, who dissents from the doctrines of the Church, I don't know that they could perform a more loyal act towards her than by offer-

ing him the Bampton Lectures for 1871, which by the way would be all the more feasible, if the book could be bought for a shilling, or the Lectures purchased separately for a penny a-piece. And if now and then they would leave behind them some standard secular work, I do not think the remembrance of their visit would be less pleasant.

Of requisites for the work of the Church in crowded centres of population few, I think, will be found more valuable than free Saturday morning schools, for the purpose of giving religious instruction to children who attend Board schools during the week. I know of one established by a friend in a densely-packed quarter of London, which has been found to answer admirably. And, as week after week, the same little faces present themselves for instruction, one cannot help feeling that bread is being cast upon the waters, that little missionaries are going forth to exert by their unconscious example an influence for good upon households which know not God. And it is a blessed fact, and one full of encouragement, that however careless parents may be of their own spiritual condition, they do not wish their children to be as godless as themselves.

In connection with Church schools of this or any other description, the laity may render great assistance in two ways ; by teaching in the schools themselves, by acting as school visitors, and looking up absent scholars. And the advantage of discharging this latter duty will be twofold ; it will insure the attendance of children, and it will furnish opportunities of becoming acquainted with families without, what to a sensitive person must always be a great drawback to district visiting, the fear of appearing to intrude.

I have two more suggestions which I am anxious to bring before the Congress. For the first I am indebted to a clergyman of long experience in one of our chief centres of industry ; for the second to a friend who devotes what spare time he has at his disposal to the care of a district in the heart of London.

The former proposes the establishment of houses in connection with some church, where "clerks, young men in shops, and others similarly occupied, men of the lower middle classes, could live together under the superintendence of one of the clergy of the parish. The rules might be of the simplest character, but there ought to be some rule, and all must be engaged in some kind of parochial work." Many young men on coming strange into a large town, would find such a house a greater boon than the "Young Men's Christian Association, Religious Exchange," suggested by Mr Moody at Glasgow, whilst "there would be a band of zealous lay helpers, all engaged in their ordinary occupations at certain times, but in their leisure hours and on Sundays helping in Church work, and gaining all the advantages of counsel, companionship, system and religious help, which such a community would afford." And if the public could be moved to provide "shelters" for their cabmen, why should not the Church do the same for those whom she may, if she will, attract into her service, and preserve from perils of the streets as deadly as any atmospheric changes. And assuredly their assistance is needed. For increase the episcopate if you will, but what is the use of generals unless there are plenty of recruiting sergeants to enlist the rank and file. Commissioned officers we have (though not enough, and would that many of them were better paid), what is wanted is more non-commissioned officers, to

enrol in the Church's ranks those multitudes who are at present so many mercenaries, ready to enter the service of those who offer the best rations, and when pay is not forthcoming to desert to a hostile camp. And as no army can dispense with the services of Sisters of Mercy, I would suggest the extension of residences for the reception of such churchwomen, and there must be many, who might be willing to exchange their broideries for more active Church work; work which they alone can accomplish; work to which they will be welcomed with a heartiness known only to those who need their help.

The second suggestion is this—That inasmuch as neither the parish nor the congregation is the unit of existence, but the diocese, there is needed, in order to bring into prominence this important principle, an instrumentality ready to the Bishop's hand, which under his guidance may weld a diocese into an organised whole—not a machine for government, but a centre of brotherhood. For this end there should be established in the Cathedral city or elsewhere, as the Bishop might think fit, an institution somewhat similar to that at Leeds, which should be a centre for collecting information and diffusing it in all parts of the diocese. Here should be found parochial directories, so much needed to enable a clergyman to commend those about to leave his parish to the care of their new pastor. Here could be kept registers of laymen willing to work in any department; whilst through such an institution a cry for help from the over-worked toilers in some short-handed, half-heathen district, might reach the leisurely ones, who have not yet heard the Master's bidding, "Go, work to-day in my vineyard." Here might be established a central committee to receive and distribute subscriptions in aid of poor parishes, and to consider such other applications for assistance as might from time to time be made to it.

And since none should be eligible for membership but communicants engaged in some work for the Church, I think it would be well to call these institutions "Church Workers' Unions." Such a name would, it seems to me, be peculiarly appropriate for an institution founded with the object of enabling men to discover, not wherein they differ, but wherein they agree; an institution in which all parties in the Church might be brought face to face with the astounding waste of power and consensus of uncoöperativeness at present existing, and forget their differences in an earnest longing to work shoulder to shoulder for their common mother.

And simultaneously with the establishment of such "Unions," I would suggest that the bishops should send through the local clergy a personal appeal to every householder who was a communicant, calling upon him to do some work for the Church, either himself, or by some members of his family, and referring him to his clergyman for information as to the way in which his services would be most useful.

If his own parish did not need them, he would refer him to the rural dean who should keep a register of "wants" in his rural deanery, and if these were supplied he could then refer the applicant to the diocesan "Union." Thus charity would begin at home—in the parish, the rural deanery, the diocese; the impetus coming in the first instance from our Fathers in God, who could thus, as has been truly said, "make the Church the Christianising agency, the spiritually-powerful instrument which she might and ought to be."

Finally, if there be one requisite for the work of the Church more necessary than another, it is the loyal co-operation of the laity with the clergy in their endeavours to supply the spiritual no less than the temporal wants of the people. Because, if the Church is to become rooted in the affections of the people, as God grant she may—clergy and laity alike must be ready to adopt and further everything which may tend to improve their condition, from the building of a church to the opening of a co-operative store or café where the poor can get food so cheap and well-cooked that they will be anxious to avail themselves of the opportunities for learning there afforded.

Indeed, I believe that if through the representations of zealous Churchmen, the authorities of Lincoln's Inn Fields could be induced to follow the example of the Templars, and throw open their Champs Elysées on certain summer evenings to the little dwellers in the surrounding rookeries, our Established Church would be as much benefited as if a branch of the Church Defence were opened in the centre of St Giles.

I have endeavoured to indicate some of the ways in which the Church may summon the laity to an attack upon the godlessness and indifferentism which abounds in crowded centres of population.

It is, perhaps, a crusade lacking the romance of the eleventh century—more need, therefore, for some Peter the Hermit to fire the youth of our country with a longing to rescue the temples of the Holy Ghost from the dominion of the devil. And shame on us, sons and daughters of the Church, if, whilst the best blood in England is only too eager to march to Coomassie, or brave the perils of the Arctic regions, we are found hanging back from an expedition at least as glorious as the vindication of British honour in Ashantee, or the discovery of the North Pole.

Would, rather, that a year which has testified to an increasing desire to be enrolled amongst the great unpaid magistracy of the kingdom might witness a like eagerness to do our mother Church an equal, nay, greater service. Would that a year memorable for the passing of a measure for the preservation of our sailors' lives might witness the kindling of a like enthusiasm for the souls of those who occupy the crowded courts and alleys in our midst.

I observe more than one company has already been formed to carry out the objects of the Artisans' Dwellings Act, and well may the Church bid their efforts God-speed. But what is cleanliness without godliness? The Church must not lag behind the philanthropist; nay, of philanthropists she should be *facile princeps*. And verily the result to be accomplished by the united effort of her forces is no mean one. Worthy it is the enthusiasm of a revived "Young England;" for it is the practical realisation of its benevolent theories. Worthy alike the earnest efforts of the humblest of Christ's disciples, as of all who would earn for themselves the glorious title of "The Poor Man's Friend;" for this, and this only, I believe to be the solution of that mighty problem described by Lord Lytton as "near to the heart of every legislator for a people, how to increase a people's splendour and its virtue, and how to diminish its penury and its crime."

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

I cannot but feel thankful that in discussing the requisites for the work of the Church, it has been arranged in this Congress to assign a distinct place to "thinly-peopled districts." It is not wonderful that the spiritual wants and the ministerial difficulties of large towns should present themselves to the minds of most persons as having overwhelming claims to consideration: those wants and difficulties are very patent, and in the present condition of England many persons are led to the belief—and I do not say that they are wrong in their belief—that the bringing of the power of the gospel to bear influentially and practically upon what are called the "masses" is the great problem which the Church has to solve: but perhaps the result may sometimes be this, that while Goliaths are being fought and we may hope slain in the large towns, there may be a tendency to forget the few sheep in the wilderness, who, nevertheless, are precious in the eye of the Great Shepherd of the sheep.

As the Bishop of a "thinly-peopled district," I could not decline to accede to the request that I would bring the wants of such districts under your notice to-day. And let me introduce my subject by asking you to consider what a "thinly-peopled district" means. The diocese of Carlisle, although in one portion of it the population is rapidly increasing in consequence of its mineral wealth, and although it contains the remarkable town of Barrow-in-Furness, which in the course of about five-and-twenty years has grown from half-a-dozen cottages to a town of 40,000 inhabitants, is yet altogether not equal in population to several of our large towns: Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester,—any one of these contains more population than the whole diocese of Carlisle, which nevertheless embraces two whole counties and a portion of a third. Or if you look to parishes, I can tell you of one which may be described as an isosceles triangle, having a base of some fifteen miles and two sides of ten miles each, and with about 1000 souls distributed over this large area; of another nine miles long, and perhaps four or five miles broad, with 2000 people; of another consisting of about 500 spread over 7000 acres, with no group of cottages more numerous than five throughout the whole extent; and so on almost indefinitely. These may seem to you to be extreme cases, but they really are not very extreme in my diocese; and it will be manifest to my brethren who have to do with populous places, that these thinly-peopled districts do involve a difficulty of which, as has been remarked in a previous paper, they know little or nothing, namely, that old one of catching your hare before you consider how you will cook it.

In contemplation of this and other cognate difficulties which attach to the spiritual shepherding of thinly-peopled districts, I came to the conclusion, when I had undertaken to read a paper at this Congress, that I should do well to make inquiry of those who had been actually engaged in the work, rather than attempt to evolve a paper "out of my own inner consciousness." Accordingly, I sent a letter of inquiry to more than twenty of the clergy in my diocese; and upon their answers, which I have carefully examined and condensed and tabulated, the remarks which I venture to put before you will be chiefly based.

Speaking generally, I think that the difficulty of thinly-peopled districts may be put in useful contrast with that of dense populations by saying, that whereas in this latter case the problem is to bring the people to the Church, in the former the problem is to bring the Church to the people. There can be no question but that personal intercourse and personal influence are at the root of all success in doing this: the clergyman of a thinly-peopled district must of necessity be a missionary, and the most important condition of success is, under God, that he should conduct his missionary operations upon a regular and well-arranged plan.

I may say, by the way (though I do not know whether it comes under the head of lay agency), that one of the best helps to a clergyman, in a large thinly-peopled district, is a stout strong pony: I have sometimes wished that our societies could and would supply this kind of aid. But whether a clergyman has four legs to go upon or only two, he must thoroughly perambulate his parish, if he would do any good. And it seems to me to be an excellent plan for a clergyman to start for an expedition of three or four days at a time: he finds plenty of farm-houses even in the wildest districts, in which he is abundantly welcome: he collects the people in the neighbourhood of his resting-place to an evening service, he becomes personally acquainted with the people, he is recognised as a friend, his future visits are anxiously expected. A very large area (as I know from an actual case) may be thoroughly visited in this way, and perhaps all the more effectively because it involves that exercise of hospitality which is never wanting in thinly-peopled districts.

There is another mode of dealing with a parish, which is perhaps most suitable to a district which is large, but not quite of what I may call missionary dimensions. Suppose a parish cut up into a certain number of districts, and each district assigned to the care of a lay-helper, chosen from among the communicants. The clergyman collects his helpers together once in a week, reads the Scriptures with them and instructs them; they on their part are his agents and messengers throughout the parish; tracts can be distributed through them, or messages sent; especially the cottage lectures, conducted by the clergyman, are under their immediate management; they arrange the place for a lecture, make it known in the neighbourhood, invite the people to attend. I am describing what has been done and found to succeed; but I think it is manifest, even without the test of experience, that such a plan of operation is likely to be productive of good results; it keeps the whole parish (as it were) *in hand*, and it enables the clergyman to do that which is so important, namely, find abundant occupation and outlet for zeal. Such a plan as that which I have just now described involves lay agency in its simplest and most natural form. Unpaid lay agency is, I apprehend, a plant which must of necessity grow spontaneously in the soil of every well-tended parish: in some form or another every clergyman must have lay help; for Sunday-school teachers and the parish choir, if for nothing else, he must look to his parishioners: all, therefore, that I would venture to suggest with regard to this part of the subject is, that perhaps this unpaid lay help might be more thoroughly organised and more extensively applied than it has been; and I cannot but believe that the plan which I have been describing, and which is essentially this,—the assigning of special portions of a parish to special persons, to be by them tended and visited

under the direction of the parish priest,—might be in many cases adopted with the most beneficial results. It sometimes appears to me that the results of clerical effort are not as great as they ought to be, in consequence of a want of method: it is as though, instead of attacking a country with military skill, a number of muskets were placed in the hands of a number of brave but undisciplined men, and they were told to *fire away*. I need not say, that there would under such circumstances be more noise and smell of gunpowder than real results: why should we expect a different result, if clergymen undertake parishes, as they sometimes do, without the least notion of the way in which a parish should be handled?

The question of paid lay help is a much more difficult one than that of unpaid. Concerning the latter the only difference of opinion can be as to the degree and the manner in which it should be used; but with regard to the former I do not find upon examination that the case is quite so clear. I am disposed, however, as the result of the inquiries which I have made, to believe that paid lay agents may be usefully employed, if you can be sure of obtaining the right men. There is a society which sends out such agents, and sends them independently of the clergyman; and in cases in which the clergyman of a parish is manifestly neglecting his duties, it is hard to find fault with any organisation, however irregular, which may be set apart for the benefit of his neglected people: but speaking of what ought to be, without reference to extreme and exceptional cases, it may be affirmed, that the lay agent, in order to do much permanent good, ought to be working in entire accord with the clergyman of the parish. This, however, is frequently not the case. The agents are in fact generally Dissenters; and though they profess to be of no sect or party in particular, still they do not themselves frequent the parish church; and this being so, it is difficult to see how their teaching and example can be conducive to permanent good. An agent of this society said to one of my clergy, "We are very willing to employ Churchmen, but you do not manufacture the article." How this may be I do not know; but certainly I could wish very much that the article *was* manufactured upon Church principles, and that it was easier than it appears to be at present to obtain the aid of men, who would be willing for moderate stipends to work in our scattered parishes, under the direction of and in cordial union with the clergyman.

These paid lay agents might very properly receive the Bishop's license. I have myself granted licenses in a few instances, and have expressed my willingness to grant them when requested by the clergy to do so; but the number of licenses granted has not been great, and the result has not in all cases been as encouraging as might be desired. It has been suggested to me, that persons would probably seek such an office, if it could be regarded as a step to the ordained ministry; and possibly this might be so; but the suggestion seems to me to be caught upon one of the horns of this dilemma; either the persons in question are sufficiently educated to be admitted as candidates for holy orders, and then this method of proceeding to candidature is unnecessary, or else they are not sufficiently educated, and then it would be an evil thing to substitute for sufficient education that which would in fact be no substitute at all. Of course there may be exceptional cases, but I am speaking now of a general principle. On the whole, I think

that for thinly-peopled districts paid lay agency is not nearly so hopeful or so worthy of a clergyman's attention as unpaid. And I cannot pass from the question of unpaid agency, without remarking that there are in all our parishes certain unpaid lay agents, who seem to me not to be turned to anything like so good an account as they might be,—I mean the churchwardens. Why should not the office of the churchwarden be regarded as having its spiritual side? why should he not exercise his office during the week as well as on Sunday? why should he not try to bring people to church as well as find places for them when they get there?

There is another point to which our energies should be directed in thinly-peopled districts, and that is the building of chapels in the outlying parts of the parish. The old parish church is not unfrequently inaccessible to large portions of the parish; sometimes the parish consists of several townships, and the church is not situated in the most populous. In cases of this kind, I would urge the importance of building chapels. It is true that not unfrequently a schoolroom may be obtained which can be used for divine service; but a schoolroom is a very imperfect substitute for a church; and it is desirable that the gathering together of a congregation in a schoolroom should be regarded as only a provisional arrangement, until better things can be done. School chapels have in some parishes been found a useful institution,—understanding by a school chapel a building "contrived a double debt to pay," having a chancel which can be shut off by a curtain when the building is used as a school. The Church Building Society has made special grants towards buildings of this kind, and they are certainly better than a mere licensed schoolroom; but still I would maintain earnestly the importance, when possible, of having a building consecrated to worship only, every association of which should tend to lead the mind heavenward. The very existence of such a building is a perennial sermon in a thinly-peopled district.

After all there are not a few cases of districts such as I am now considering, in which the true remedy is subdivision and the endowment of new parishes carved out of the old. Thank God, the spirit which led to the formation and endowment of our ancient parishes has not entirely passed away, as I can testify from experience; and the very best kind of lay agency is that by which a distant township, practically cut off from the parish church, is supplied, through the liberality of some godly and wealthy layman, with a church and a parson and a parsonage of its own.

It may naturally be asked, whether the mission system which has of late been so much developed in England is applicable to the thinly-peopled districts with which we are now concerned. I am disposed to think that it can scarcely be regarded as generally applicable; in the case of villages such as are common in the south, where a town can be taken as a centre of operations, a mission may probably be carried out with advantage; but in the case of such districts as I have chiefly in mind, I question whether there is much opening for an agency of this kind. I speak with some hesitation upon this subject, as an experiment is being made in my own diocese, the result of which may tend to modify my opinion. I have sometimes thought, however, that it might be desirable, if possible, to have in addition to the parochial clergy a small number of itinerants, who would be able to go from place to place, and cheer the hearts both of ministers and people by an occasional visit. But this would be rather a

luxury than a necessary; that which is absolutely necessary must in general be done by the minister himself, with such aid as his own parish supplies.

Yes; we must come to this conclusion, and it is a very solemn one for those who have been called to the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments in Christ's Church, namely, that whatever kind of lay agency is used, whether much or little, whether paid or unpaid, whether male or female, yet after all the life and soul of the work of Christ in the parish must be the clergyman himself. And I need not say that the clergyman of a thinly-peopled district, though he may be free from many of the difficulties of his brethren in large towns, has nevertheless difficulties peculiarly his own. The position of a man presumably cultivated in mind and tastes to a degree far surpassing the cultivation of any of his flock, in a district in which he has no opportunity of exchanging thoughts with educated friends, is one of a very trying, sometimes of a very depressing, and even of a dangerous, character. It is not merely the traditional "Fell Parson," but men of a much higher type, and of whom you might expect better things, who under the influences of a "thinly-peopled district" fall into habits incompatible with personal holiness or with a useful ministry. This of course is a subject into which I need not go; but I could not refrain from introducing just this passing hint of a side of the question, which practically is one of the most important, and concerning which much might be said, if the occasion and the time permitted.

In conclusion, I would affirm that the only thing, which under any circumstances can make a ministry in a thinly-peopled district useful to the people or tolerable to the minister, is steady, systematic, diligent, God-fearing, and soul-loving work. Concerning the manner and the degree in which lay help should be employed, there is, as I have found, and as might have been expected, much difference of opinion, but there can be no difference of opinion as to the necessity of having as the head of the parish, a wise, discreet, and holy priest, able both by word and example to edify those whom God has committed to his care.

The Rev. Canon Walsham How.

Introduction.—It is often thought that the management of a scattered country parish is an easier task than that of a populous town parish. I doubt it very much. It seems to me that, of the two, the country parish requires the greater tact and delicacy of handling. In the first place, the smaller the population the greater is the relative importance of each individual—an importance by no means apt to be overlooked by its possessor. In the second place, it is natural that, on the average, the dwellers in the country should be somewhat more straitened in their views and of less expanded sympathies than the dwellers in towns. And, in the third place, for the country parishioners there is no choice of church or of clergyman. This last is a most important element in the whole matter. In a town, if you don't like the clergyman or the service, you go somewhere else; and, if *you* do not like them, others do, so that things arrange themselves quietly, and open collisions can be avoided. Even mistakes can be made with comparative impunity. In the country, given an indiscreet clergyman, a

squire or two with strong prejudices, or a dissenting clique with external wire-pullers, and collisions are inevitable, mistakes sometimes irremediable. I know of a good many more country parishes than town ones where things are all crooked, with very little hope of getting them straight. So I am convinced that tact, gentleness, and consideration for others, however valuable in all cases, are of special importance in the management of small country parishes. Even if the views and wishes of the parishioners, or of a small fraction of them, are unreasonable, they should be treated with kindly respect. It is surely better to give way in matters not of principle (and, by the way, it is by no means uncommon to confound wilfulness with principle), to deny one's self what may be called the luxuries of worship, and at least to wait, than to risk losing confidence, support, and perhaps fellow-workers. I doubt the expediency of even voluntary parochial councils in country parishes, but I am sure a wise clergyman will take counsel continually with those who would naturally form his parochial council, if he had one.

Guild of Church-Workers.—It is of primary importance to enlist as many as possible in the work of the Church in any parish. To this end, I would form a society or guild of all the Church-workers I could get hold of—Sunday-school teachers, district visitors, singers in the choir, collectors for Church societies, and any others whom I could find an excuse for enrolling as Church-workers. This society should meet periodically, perhaps quarterly, in some parish-room or schoolroom, for a little service and for consultation upon the Church work of the parish. There should also be an anniversary day, with an early celebration of the Holy Communion in the morning, and a social gathering in the evening, followed by a service in church, and a special address to the Church-workers. There are numberless little details of work which can be talked over in such a society, and the discussion of which adds great life and interest to the work itself. By all means show as much deference as you can to such a band of workers. The parish ought to be made to feel that the clergyman, while immoveable in matters of real principle, is most anxious to take all classes into his confidence, and to show deference to all the reasonable (and sometimes even to the unreasonable) wishes of his people.

Society of Holy Living.—Another very valuable bond of union in a small parish is the formation of a little guild or association with a view to mutual help in holiness of living. I would recommend, as the simplest form of such association, that established by Mr Sydney Tyacke of Helston in Cornwall, which is called "The Society of Holy Living," and has branches in a large number of parishes. It has very few rules, and the briefest possible intercessory prayer to be used by the members, and the meetings of the society may be regulated just as each branch may wish. Perhaps a monthly meeting on Sunday, when some devotional book might be read and explained, with prayer, would answer as well as any other plan, and if only three or four were thus gathered together monthly, the benefit to these would be great, and you would have what is of inestimable value—a nucleus of devout people with a high and holy aim, whose influence and example must tell upon others.

Thoroughness of Work.—I suppose that one great advantage which a thinly-peopled parish possesses over a populous one is in the possibility of much greater thoroughness of work. There is less to be done in the way

of order and system and machinery; more in the way of individual intercourse. The people in the small parish can be, and ought to be, thoroughly known and individually cared for. I am quite aware of the danger of overdoing this, and of thus destroying independence, and fostering a spirit of subservience and unreality among the poor. But I really doubt whether this is a very serious danger practically. My experience would lead me to the belief that the necessity for warning the clergy, at least, against spoiling their people by over-visiting is not pressing. If I may venture to counsel some of my younger brethren, whose lot may be cast in pleasant country places, I would say, Know your people thoroughly. Not only visit systematically, but make a point of seizing upon every pretext for a visit. Above all, whenever there is the slightest misunderstanding, or you have reason to believe any parishioner is in any way annoyed with you, don't leave it to time to heal the sore, but go and talk it out. Half the misunderstandings in the world can be healed by a little kindly and timely explanation. Show that the clergyman *cannot* take offence. Be servant of all.

School-Teaching.—Another advantage which the country parish offers is the opportunity of daily opening the school with prayer, and conducting the religious teaching. This is scarcely possible among the multiplicity of engagements in a town parish, but where it is possible, it is of the utmost value both to teacher and to taught. To the former it brings punctuality, system, an intimate knowledge of the Bible, and a power of entering into, and adapting himself to, the modes of thought and expression familiar to the poor. To the latter, the systematic religious teaching by the clergyman is not only in itself of the utmost value, but is also undoubtedly the most effectual instrument of education, drawing out (if only tolerably well done) all the faculties and powers of the child to a degree attainable by no other lesson of the day.

Children's Services, &c.—It seems often forgotten, especially in country parishes, how large a proportion of our congregations is composed of children. Surely they should have their own services, at least occasionally, in which everything should be adapted to them. A short, bright, musical service, with several children's hymns to popular tunes, and a short sermon, very simple, very interesting, illustrated by anecdote, and enlivened by a little catechising in the shape of a few questions now and then, this will always be a treat to the children. It must not, however, be thought that preaching to children is easier than preaching to grown-up people. It is really much harder, and requires even more care and preparation. Of course, it must be unwritten, and it is better to speak from the lectern or chancel-step (as less formal) than from the pulpit. It is a plan that has answered for the Sunday-school teachers in turn to remain in the school on Sunday morning with the younger children, when the elder ones go to church, and to give them a short service there. The teacher will dismiss them in time for him to get to church for part of the service. It is also very desirable on one day in the week to get a little class of the children of a higher grade than those in the National School. These are often sadly ignorant of the very elements of religious truth. Let the children see and feel that they are loved and cared for, and they will not be slow to repay it. It is a good rule never to pass a child in your parish without a pleasant smile of recognition.

Employments for Church-Helpers.—Exercise your ingenuity in finding all sorts of employment for all willing to be employed; and choose your workers from all classes. If a really devout and efficient layman is available, by all means let him conduct cottage lectures, and act as lay-reader, with the Bishop's sanction and appointment, if this may be had. A national schoolmaster may often be a very fit man for such work. But, of course, such help as this is not to be expected in most country parishes. There are, however, very few parishes so small as to afford no one willing to undertake a district to visit or a class to teach. I used when young to despise tracts. I have lived to know better. The people in country parishes, at least, read them and profit by them, and their regular distribution is very useful. Church-helpers may also be employed to great advantage in the collection, monthly or quarterly, of small subscriptions to missionary and other Church work. It is wonderful how much may be done to help good works, if the pence of the poor be regarded, and not only the guineas of the rich. But it is necessary that an accurate statement of all money so collected be printed and distributed annually. The training of, and singing in, the choir; the management of mother's meetings, clothing-clubs, and the like; the selling of books, such as Bibles, prayer-books, and hymn-books; the superintendence of a reading-room, night-school, or classes; these are among the occupations which even small parishes can provide for willing hands.

Daily Prayer.—Let me plead for the use of the Church's Daily Prayer, at least in the morning, even in very small country parishes. No doubt very few can attend; but, if it be only the clergyman's own family that are able to do so, it is the public acknowledgment of a great principle, and a standing protest against the notion that religion is a thing for Sundays only. I saw a letter in the *Rock* about a year ago, from one who said he never heard of the introduction of daily prayer into a church without a shudder, because it was the substitution of the outward and formal for the inward and spiritual. I suppose the writer of that letter would be incredulous if I spoke of the comfort and refreshment which the Church's Daily Prayer is to thousands in our land. I can bear witness how precious to two or three hard-working mothers of families are the peaceful twenty minutes thus given from time to time to God. But we will use that letter as a warning, and pray God to preserve us from the outward and formal. It is our danger in everything. It may be possible in Lent to add Evening Prayer with a very short devotional reading daily.

Mission-Rooms and School-Churches.—Every fresh centre of Church life is a blessing to a scattered parish. Let mission-rooms and school-churches be multiplied as far as practicable. We have too long allowed the zeal of our dissenting brethren to forestall us in our outlying districts. No doubt there is difficulty in supplying the service in these on Sundays, but at least let us do what we can.

Occasional Services in Houses.—During the winter months, besides regular cottage-lectures, it is a good plan to hold occasional meetings for prayer and instruction in distant farm-houses, or other suitable buildings, making the arrangements, and giving personal invitations to the neighbours, a few days beforehand. An occasional missionary meeting in such outlying districts is very popular.

The Parish Church.—But, after all, the parish church must be the

real centre of life, worship, and instruction, even in the most scattered parish. I am afraid our services and our preaching are not always as helpful and interesting and edifying to the poor, who form the bulk of our country congregations, as they might be. I should like to say a great deal about this, but I will only venture on thus much: Let our services be very hearty, very simple, very reverent, very congregational; and let our preaching be very plain, very earnest, and very practical.

Conclusion.—Lastly, let me not omit all mention of those cases of thinly-peopled country parishes in which the clergyman stands all but, or quite, alone, having none to help him. Such cases are not infrequent in Wales, where the great majority of the people have been alienated from the Church. Few positions are more trying. It needs indeed great grace and resolution to maintain a high standard of life and duty, where there is no one to whose sympathy and counsel one can turn in one's hours of depression and faint-heartedness. Yet the one only hope in such cases lies in the maintenance of that high standard. The life of St Francis de Sales presents a notable example of the wonderful change wrought by simple perseverance in the daily punctual visit, and performance of the Church's offices, in a town where there was not one for months to welcome the visit or care for the service. And the example of one man living a holy and consistent life, and lovingly anxious to help the souls of his people, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, cannot ever be without its fruit. If there are few that listen, the servant is not faring worse than the Master; and the saving of one soul is worth a life's labour.

ADDRESS.

Mr Salt, M.P.

While I have been listening to all that has been so well advanced by the able and experienced men who have read papers, I have found that the subject that we are discussing to-day has been rapidly diminishing, until at length it is completely exhausted. I must therefore ask to be excused if I endeavour to reach the goal by another and less direct route. In looking at the form in which the subject has been proposed for consideration, I have been greatly impressed with the breadth of its scope and character. That form implies that to some extent, so far as regards the existing system, there must be some confession of weakness and some acknowledgment of failure; but in that clear and simple acknowledgment of failure, I, for one, perceive much strength and gather much hope for the future. If any institution in this country is to maintain for many generations a lasting hold upon the affections of the people, it must not only from time to time put before them the work which it has done, and the work which it is now doing, but it must not shrink from careful and unflinching criticism as to its own defects, in order to ascertain how far it is attaining the great and vital objects for which it was originally created, and for which it continues to exist. And there is another point which strikes me as arising out of the terms of the question put before us to-day. We are asked in a most pointed manner to turn our attention to that which is the real work of the Church here. We are asked how the Church can best bring home

to the poor and ignorant the inestimable advantages of Church influence and Church teaching. Sometimes we are told that the Church is going to pieces on account of internal differences, but the differences which exist in the English Church are nothing when compared with those which agitate the Church of Rome; and they are a mere trifle when compared with those which separate, as by insuperable barriers, the various sects of nonconformists. I, for one, look upon the differences of which many complain rather as the signs and symptoms of healthy movement and of strong and vigorous action, because, with very few exceptions, underneath those loudly expressed differences there exists a lasting bond of faith and union and love. We are sometimes told that political agitation will end in the dis-establishment and destruction of the English Church, but this I know full well, that if once we succeed in creating an organisation which will be strong enough to bring home to every man, woman, and child in this country, the benefit of living lives based on a Christian education, then our differences will become small, our difficulties will disappear, and the cry for dis-establishment will become a thing of the past. Well, then, it appears to me from the form of the question that what we have to consider is, how the Church as a human society is to carry on its contest with misery, vice, and ignorance; and how the members of the Church are to prepare for that conflict. It almost seems a truism, to say that three things are required—organisation, men, and money. With regard to men and money, I believe little difficulty need be experienced; but I would just say with regard to the choice of the men who are to work, and especially of lay agents, let us not be above choosing the very poorest working men if they have their hearts in the work, because they are the men who in their simple and perhaps rough language may be the best instruments for bringing home to their own class those truths that we desire to inculcate; and we should not forget that St Paul made use of the labours of a fugitive slave. As to money, all I will say is, that many pence make many pounds; but organisation, I believe, is the thing to which we should devote our most earnest attention. What sort of organisation is it that we want? It must be a system equal to every emergency and prepared to cope with every contingency, however strange or unexpected. It must be equal to dealing with the sailors who occasionally visit the seaports of our shores, as well as the cottagers who spend their whole lives within sight of their own homes. Our organisation must be contrived to meet the case of the millionaire of the West End of the metropolis no less than of the millions who throng the crowded East. It must deal with the navigators on the canals, with the shepherds watching their flocks on the lonely hills, with the toiling, sorrowful women of the Black Country, and with the energetic, burly mechanics of every manufacturing town in the country. Then arises the question, Is the organisation which we now have sufficient for all these things? If so, why was this question raised? The organisation on which we have hitherto depended is the parochial system, of which we are justly proud, as it has been the credit and strength of the English Church for ages; but because it has done so much, it does not follow that it is perfect. I believe I am correct in saying that in the Gallican Church the parochial clergy are over-ruled and almost crushed by episcopal authority; but in the Church of England, on the contrary, the parochial clergy have great power, and sometimes even check and defy the authority of the Bishops. In none of the sister Churches of the Church of England has the parochial system been adopted in the form in which she has it; neither in Canada, the Cape, Natal, New Zealand, Australia, or India. If I mention India, it is that I may say that there harmony prevails among the Christians of different communions, leading to a degree of intercourse and friendship which they find of great value in their struggle with

the worst forms of heathenism—a line of conduct which Churchmen at home would do well to imitate. What is the remedy I propose? Not to destroy the independence of the parochial clergy, which is the very life and soul of our Church. Rather let us go back on the old lines. We shall find that formerly there was a diocesan authority at the head-quarters of the Cathedral from which proceeded a missionary spirit, which succeeded in spreading Christianity throughout the length and breadth of the land. There are many difficulties and dangers with which the parochial clergy, however able, however brave and strong, are unable to cope, but strength and ability might be brought to bear upon the weakest places of the present system; scattered populations might be sought for; populations which had sprung up rapidly might be assisted; roving people might be searched for, if in the Cathedral towns there were men—laymen and clergymen—supported by a small amount of money which would cheerfully be given, and who, acting under the orders of a leader, might be sent forth by him to minister to destitute and neglected districts.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. John W. Bardsley, M.A.

As the Bishop of Carlisle has pleaded for the few sheep in the wilderness, I will draw the attention of the Congress for a few moments from them and the "stout pony" which has already become famous, to that part of the subject which refers to the crowded centres of population, for in them my experience, such as it is, has been acquired. With the remembrance of the intemperance and debauchery, the irreligion and crime, which too often pervade these same large centres, there will be few to deny that this is the pressing practical question of the day, and that if our discussions contribute anything to the solution of this great problem, the Congress at Stoke will be remembered even for higher reasons than its generous hospitality and Christian concord. We cannot, however, deal with the subject unless our minds grasp the rapid rate at which the population of the county districts is flowing into the large centres. It is not merely that, during the last 250 years, the population of the country has multiplied fivefold, but that the rural districts are rapidly being drained of their population. In thirty-four of these large centres, containing 4,000,000 of people, 52½ per cent., it has been ascertained, do not attend any place of worship whatever. The question then is, How can these dark spots be transformed into centres of light and life and spiritual love? The parochial system, valuable as it is, will prove utterly insufficient if it be regarded as a sort of cast-iron machine instead of a living organisation. In the first place, let me say that, for the head of such a centre of population, it is essential that we should have the right man in the right place. The Church is suffering in not a few great towns from the round-peg and square-hole system. We have been told by one of the previous speakers that men present themselves for the ministry without possessing a single qualification for it, and there are patrons, and ecclesiastical patrons, too, who nominate men for even the most important posts, who are wholly unfitted for them. For these large centres of population the best men that can be found are wanted. For the country, if I may dare to say it, good men may do, but for these large centres none but the best—men not committed to any theological hobby which they are ready to ride over the heads of their people. Who would deny the value of prophetical studies? but what, for

instance, does a poor widow, with ten hungry mouths at home, care for a continual disquisition on the ten toes of the Beast? She longs to hear of a God who will hear the ravens when they cry, and who has promised to be a father to the fatherless and a husband to the widow. To what extent can any archæological argument in favour of a cope or against it lighten her pressing cares? Our great centres want a practical man; not a mere bookworm; not a novice; not one of the ancients, but one who, with burning love for Christ in his heart, and intense love of souls, with some experience and much sympathy, with earnest prayer and incessant toil, will seek to win sinners from the error of their ways. Where such mistakes in the exercise of patronage have been made, the arrangements of our Church ought to be sufficiently elastic to admit speedy rectification. Few sights are more pitiable to those who have the welfare of our great centres at heart than to see a good man, saddened by failure, growing grey amid the regrets of his friends and the silent contempt of his opponents, in the great town where he is doomed to labour, uncheered by success, and yet conscious that, in a different scene, his special gifts and talents would, by God's blessing, have ensured rich results. Such a state of things is not fair to the man, not fair to the parish. The claims of Christ's cause cannot afford it, and the arrangements of our Church ought not to allow it. I cannot help expressing my sorrowful dissent from the remark of Mr Salt, that in large centres of population there are no serious divisions amongst members of the Church. It was only yesterday that I read in the paper of Bradlaugh, the National Reformer, language of this kind, "Look at these Christians, see them quarrel about the cut of a coat and the colour of a vestment! 'Whom the gods intend to destroy they first make mad;' there is no need for me to lecture against them." Turning to the subject of lay agency, I would say that the battle of lay agency as a principle has been fought and won, and with thankfulness I remember it has been won by the staunch Evangelicals of the last generation. Those who differ from me most will, I am sure, agree with me that there are many good things which the Church owes to those staunch Evangelicals; but though that battle has been fought and won, we have not yet dispelled from all quarters the feeling that spiritual work is the exclusive function of the ministry. We have to teach people not only that they may do Church work, but that they *must* do it—that all Christians have a spiritual priesthood, and that those who have been sprinkled with the precious blood of Christ and anointed with the oil of the Holy Spirit's unction have spiritual sacrifices to offer. We have to teach them that in the spiritual hive there can be no drones, and that if men will not work neither shall they eat. The multitudes, as in the days of the Lord, are still gathered round us in these great centres, far from their home, the day far spent, and they have nothing to eat. And must we not add that, as in the days of our Lord, the remedy too often suggested is a pocket remedy, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" A subscription list is relied upon, and how many curates, how many readers can we secure, is too often the only care, instead of making use of the material at our disposal. "Give *ye* them to eat," still says our Lord. Order, however, was maintained. The multitudes were distributed in hundreds and in fifties. The Supreme Giver was recognised, "Bring them hither to Me." And when He blessed and brake, the law of distribution was the law of multiplication, and "they did all eat, and were filled." The miracle is a parable in action, and applicable to our own times. Let the Church enjoin her faithful laity to give the multitude to eat, rather than timidly inquire "Whence shall we buy?" Let the laity seek to observe the laws of order, and not distribute at random, but in the due arrangement of divided population and a recognised head, under that Great Head who alone can bless, whilst they offer to the Church their

willing service. Let our lay friends be taught not to underrate the provision because their resources may be small and poor. Let it be bread and not a stone ; and then, if only barley bread, it will, if broken by the Lord, feed the spiritually starving multitudes; and, perhaps, because barley bread, it may be all the more adapted to the rough digestion of the masses. It is necessary that our lay friends should have set before them the infinite variety of forms into which their loving efforts can be thrown. The building of God's house in these latter days requires no less a diversity of labour than in the days when the tabernacle in the wilderness was set up, when men, women, and children all found scope for their varied talents. Parish councils—I would not be without mine for any consideration ; district visiting, by which the clergyman is alone enabled to reach in large town parishes the lost and the perishing ; Sunday-schools and tract distributing; these are but a few of the many agencies which our lay friends can occupy. No one can estimate the value of a good tract. My experience is the reverse of Mr Marshall's, and the very fact which I can attest, that if the same tract be distributed a second time, the people recognise it and at once complain, sufficiently refutes the statement that tracts are unread. If Mr Marshall's people do not read them, let him look to the character of the tracts he is circulating. My time is fast running out, and I must leave unsaid much that I had wished to say. Let me, however, add, as my last words, that we want a large and liberal heart towards those who are without. If the grain be in danger of rotting upon the ground, pleasant though it might be to gather it within our own ecclesiastical barn, yet if the barn be full we must surely wish God-speed to those who run up for us poles and a tarpauling, only if, under its shelter, grain can be preserved, which at the great ingathering shall be transferred to the Master's garner. Let the principle of lay agency be fully carried out, and we shall then want no Church Defence Societies. Such lay workers are already swelling our ranks, and, in spite of evil prophets, I do not believe the days of the Church of England are numbered. She is as a tree bringing forth much fruit in her old age ; her boughs even now overshadow the land, and those who go by will yet, I believe, partake of her fruits.

Rev. George Williams.

I wish to speak especially on the subject of lay preaching. I would strongly advocate it in the widest sense as one of the great wants of the day. It is a very primitive institution of the Christian Church, and one for which there was the highest authority in the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. In the latter there are two examples of the way in which lay preaching was employed for the building up of the Church and for the perfecting of the saints. Those who were scattered after the death of Stephen went about everywhere, preaching the Gospel, and gained converts in places which no apostle had visited ; and that eloquent man Apollos, who appears never to have been ordained, went to Corinth, and was there most usefully engaged in preaching for "the perfecting of the saints."

Rev. E. A. Hillyard, M.A.

It would, perhaps, be to the interest of the Congress, as well as of the last speaker, if I continue the same subject which has been so ably introduced by Mr Williams, and the subject is, in a word, the restoration of the minor orders. The great need in the Church of the future would be agents for the religious education of the young, demanding

trained and skilled catechists. I would remind my hearers that the Canons (LXXVII.) have provisions contemplating episcopal supervision of schoolmasters, rendering a restoration of an order of catechists comparatively easy. As to another sphere of lay agency, I would advocate the entire abolition of the Act of Uniformity, and the permission to laymen both to preach, and to read morning and evening services, remarking that it is a noteworthy fact that this advocacy of the exercise of the lay priesthood came chiefly from those mostly who were called the sacerdotal party in the Church. With reference to a remark made by Mr Bardsley, he said, as for Mr Bradlaugh's exultation about the divisions in the Church produced by vestures, there would be no chance of developing the resources of lay agency, or of doing the Church's work, till there was a discontinuance of those detestable ecclesiastical suits.

Mr Charles Clement Walker, of Silleshall.

Having spent half my life in so populous a place as London, and the other half in country parishes, I am anxious to say a few words respecting lay agency. After my confirmation, the preparatory instructions of which I acknowledge with thankfulness, being desirous of being useful, I consulted my clergyman, who recommended me to take a class in a Sunday-school. I did so, and worked up through the younger classes to the eldest, and at last had one entirely of young men, which I held for six years, morning and afternoon. Those who know London are aware that there are a number of halls open on Sunday evenings, in which discussions take place on disputed points of theology, and more especially on questions of a freethinking tendency. I found that the young men in my class went in the evening to these halls, as on the following Sunday they would come to me with the difficulties that they had heard raised to a belief in the Christian faith. I venture to think that if Dr Colenso had had the difficulties of such a class to meet, he would not have needed a conference with an intelligent Zulu Kaffir in an African wilderness to raise doubts, with no one to consult, but they would probably have been solved, and his melancholy book not written. I am thankful to say that in our case not one became an unbeliever, and every one is a member of a Christian Church. It should not be forgotten that a good many of these sceptical lecturers have been Sunday scholars, and there is therefore not only plenty of work for the laity, but the quality of that work must stand the test of inquiry and opposition. When I came into the country I found quite a different state of things. In London there are practically no parishes, a layman may do much good without the clergyman; but in the country everything is under the parochial arrangement, and no clergyman would feel happy if a layman acted without him. It is impossible to speak in terms of too great praise of the labours of country clergymen, who are gentlemen of education, many of whom give up their whole time to their parishes. Some speakers have said that it is a good thing to have lay help in country parishes, but there is little scope, and of what there is there is often no encouragement for it. It may be said, "Why not apply for the bishop's licence?" But a layman cannot be expected always to take out a bishop's licence to do good. Two instances in my own neighbourhood may illustrate it. The clergyman of a parish was taken suddenly ill, and although every effort was made, could get no minister to take the services—those who live in country parishes know this difficulty—and the conscientious man left his bed to take the morning service, but was laid prostrate by it, and rather than let those who came to church in the afternoon find it closed (there being no time for notice to be given, as many came miles to church),

he would have gone again at the peril of his life, but his two churchwardens, educated men, who regularly read the lessons, begged him to desist, offered, and did conduct a service of singing and lessons, and read a sermon, chosen by the clergyman, without prayers, which was criticised disapprovingly by several clergy afterwards. The other case was in a similar emergency in another small church, when the whole service was conducted by the resident squire, a magistrate of two counties, Deputy Lieutenant and Member of Parliament, who regularly takes a class in a Sunday school, and one of the best men in the county. Everybody was delighted to find such men willing to do such good, except some clergymen, who spoke of it almost as an ecclesiastical offence, gravely saying: "If such things are allowed, what is the use of us?" Now, what encouragement is this for a layman? I have always found laymen willing to help, but clergymen must not expect laymen always to be after their manner. And as I would advise a young lady, who is sure that her image is at the bottom of her manly lover's heart, not to be too anxious if he is not always writing and talking "love," so I would exhort a clergyman not to expect his layman to be continually talking "Church," but to be satisfied, and accept him thankfully if the love of Christ is at the bottom of his heart.

The Right Rev. The President.

To prevent loss of time, it may be well if I state at once that, in my opinion, the three aggrieved parishioners of which we hear so much, are no part of the lay agency contemplated in our present subject.

The Rev. H. B. Bowlby.

I wish to speak upon one segment of the great circle of lay agency, I mean the work which may be done and the help which may be given by working men in influencing their own order. It may not be a very heroic part of lay agency, and it labours under some disadvantages, but it has also some countervailing advantages. We have working men always on the spot. They have continual opportunities of access to working men, however, which are not always open to the clergy or to the well-educated layman. Pious working men can visit and pray with the sick; they can induce their fellow working men to attend church, distribute tracts, and forward the gospel work in a variety of ways which cannot be practised by the clergy. As to tracts, if well selected and given judiciously by the distributor—the proper tract to the proper person—they will not only be useful, but sometimes the means of conversion. I have known them eagerly read, and even copied out by the reader. I wish just to mention a small association of spiritually-minded young men, who were banded together in a parish in Kent with which until recently I was connected, as lay helpers of the clergyman. We used to call them "deacons," not because they had any episcopal authority, but because they were exactly seven in number, "men of honest report," and in their measure "full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom," enabling us to give more of our time "to prayer and the ministry of the Word." It will interest the Congress to know how these men were obtained, and how they were kept at the work. They were obtained by means of the Bible and Confirmation classes and by the attractive powers, drawing them on towards the higher life, of

those clergymen with whom I had the pleasure of working, and who possessed so much of the freshness and energy of youth, combined with cultivation, devotedness, and spirituality of mind. They were retained in their work by continual meetings for prayer and mutual counsel, and by regularly partaking of the Holy Communion together. I believe that young men may be so obtained in almost any parish, and when obtained will be found to be a great blessing and help to the clergy.

Colonel Bagnall, High Sheriff of Staffordshire.

The reader of the first paper defined to us that which belongs to the office of the priesthood, and I am quite sure that lay agency in no way interferes with anything which belongs to that office. On the contrary, it magnifies that office. The question of lay agency in this diocese is nothing new. Some years ago it was brought before the Diocesan Conference, and received the approbation of that body and the assent also of the Bishop of the diocese. There are many men in the diocese of Lichfield in different positions in society, working as lay agents, some in populous districts, and others in small parishes. It is my privilege to be one of those lay agents, and to have associated with me a gallant officer in Her Majesty's service, an eminent medical man, and several working men. We work under the licence of the Bishop; we have more than one mission chapel where we assist. In the parish where I assist, instead of two services on Sunday there are now sixteen. It is utterly impossible for the clergy to take all these services, and some of them are confided to us laymen. We read the morning and evening Prayer, and we preach, I am glad to say, not to empty chairs. God has blessed the work, so that we feel encouraged to go on. But we do not preach within the walls of the mission chapel only, for unfortunately there are many people who will not come within the chapels if nothing is done outside to bring them in; and so we go forth singing hymns from "Hymns Ancient and Modern," and in this way gather our congregations; and large numbers of people are thus brought within the sound of gospel teaching, to which they listen with respect and attention. We are often gladdened with the sight of people after these out-door services going back with us into the mission-chapel, joining in the service there, and listening to the sermon which follows. It is gratifying to know that many of these have become regular church goers and communicants; and we have in each mission-chapel a small but increasing band of regular communicants. In my opinion, those clergy who hold the highest opinion of the priestly office are always the most ready to accept the services of laymen given in the manner of which I have been speaking; and my experience is that there will always be found a band of laymen, not gathered from this class of society or that, but of all classes ready to rally round the clergymen thus willing to use them in doing all they can for the love of God and love to the souls of men.

The Right Rev. The President.

I think I ought to tell the meeting that the last speaker, Colonel Bagnall, is at this moment High Sheriff of Staffordshire; and that the gallant officer of whom he has spoken is Major Drake, an officer of Engineers, who, having come into the diocese to form a military station at Lichfield, waited upon me for a licence to act as a lay deacon, which, of course, I gave him; and he is now working with Colonel Bagnall.

Rev. B. F. Smith, Rector of Crayford, Kent, Diocesan Inspector of Schools, Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral, and Rural Dean.

There is one kind of lay co-operation to which I have heard but slight allusion, and that is such as could be rendered by the mechanic and labouring class. I am conversant with a rural population bordering on a town amongst which a goodly body of working men formed themselves into a Church Aid Society. The idea had been at first, not only that by meeting together they might cement their Church fellowship, but that they might undertake certain evangelistic work among their neighbours in the way of visiting them. The more ambitious part of the scheme was soon found to be impracticable. But what remained—the monthly meeting for information on subjects connected with the Church, and for taking counsel with the clergy on any parochial arrangements—proved, through many years, of standing benefit and interest. Whilst the little actual employment that was undertaken by the members, in becoming the medium of communication between the clergyman and their working neighbours in calling meetings, promoting subscriptions, &c., was by no means valueless to him, and made them feel themselves working members of their own communion. This feeling was much deepened when united to receive the communion together. In the Church especially, their help, ever ready to be called for in collecting the alms, was a standing witness of their hearty interest in the services. In the long lines of collectors who might be seen filing up to the chancel, it was no uncommon, and yet a most cheering sight, to observe a gentleman and his gardener walking side by side, equally claiming their right as laymen to co-operate with the clergy. The members of this Society have frequently professed how much they were helped to stand against the sneers and objections levelled by their fellow-workmen against the Church and her ministers by the information and the insight into the motives of their clergy gained at the monthly meetings. And to the latter it was a frequent source of comfort to know how loyal a knot of sympathisers they could count upon, in that section of the community into whose inner life and feelings it was so difficult, but for these lay agents, to penetrate. I am convinced that in many a rural parish the elements existed for such Church co-operation, whereby the crust might be broken through, which now divides the upper from the lower social stratum of professing Churchmen, and which prevents the free circulation of that brotherly love which is the bond of peace and of all virtues.

The Rev. J. F. Kitto, M.A.

It has for the last nine years been my good fortune to minister amongst the dense masses of population in the east of London; and though I do not profess to belong to that advanced school of clergy to which Mr Hillyard alluded, I have never hesitated to claim, and never failed to get, the hearty support of the laity for any Church work it was necessary to undertake. We clergy ought to look on working for the Church as a means of educating the laity—a means of promoting spiritual advancement and growth in grace not to be denied to the laity. A man will give his special interest to that to which he devotes his powers and efforts, and we ought to give to the laity work to do for God as a means of spiritual advancement. There is another thing not to be lost sight of in giving work to the laity. It creates a bond of union in those who are members of the same church who may not agree on some points. The way I would deal with people who had different ideas of Church government, would be to set them to work together to meet the wants of the souls of others. Although mine is not a large parish for London, I have a large band of

workers, both men and women, who act together in a spirit of Christian fellowship, which makes their work all the more effectual. We clergy ought to put on the forefront of all our teaching and all our calls upon the laity, that every man ought to work for the Church to which he belongs, as a duty he owes to Christ. We have, I fear, failed very much in this respect in times past. A Christian who does not work for Christ is likely to be a weak and flabby Christian; lacking strength, and force, and earnestness in his relations to God. Then, further, it is the duty of the clergy to find the laity work. It may be difficult, but it is indispensable, and we must not be afraid to use all the lay agency we can get, not only of the educated and middle classes, but of the working classes. Some of my most faithful and zealous helpers are working men and women. Whenever any gift has been bestowed by God, He intends that it shall be used for His own glory. While the minds of the educated classes can be best reached through those of educated men, the great masses of the people must be reached by working men. It will not be effected merely by sending amongst them ordained ministers, but by the action of pious, God-fearing, zealous working men, acting on working men in their workshops and their homes.

The Rev. W. Caine, M.A.

When I gave in my card I wished to bring two thoughts before the Congress; but one has already been so much elaborated that I need hardly mention it. I mean the dissemination of tracts. What I wanted to say was, that if we do not distribute good literature, bad and impure literature will be read, with the result not unfrequently of the production of crime. Boy criminals have told me over and over again that they have been led into crime by reading such literature. I would also allude to another point, which has not been mentioned—we do not always get the best lay assistants. Some of the best lay assistants that I know are the local preachers amongst the Wesleyans. You will be surprised at that remark, but many of them become preachers amongst the Wesleyans, because there was no work for them in the Church of England. I am giving you my own experience. Three years ago I became rector of a parish in which I had very few Church people to help me in any way, and in which there are from 6000 to 7000 people, with one church and three dissenting chapels. When I entered on my work I made a house to house visitation, although six-tenths were Dissenters. I called even upon the ministers of the dissenting congregations, as I regarded myself as their pastor, and treated them as fellow-workers. I co-operated with them as much as possible, and I became President of the Band of Hope Union, and they were Vice-Presidents. The result has been that my church, which will hold only 850, was crowded on a Sunday afternoon some months ago with nearly 2000 children from my own school and the dissenting schools, and after the afternoon service I addressed them. If the clergy would co-operate with the Wesleyan and Independent ministers in efforts to check sin and vice and intemperance in their parishes, thousands of Dissenters would in time be absorbed into the National Church.

Mr Carleton Baynes.

I cordially agree with the remarks of Dr Marshall upon the necessity of maintaining a high standard, and of striving after reality in employing laymen to work for the Church; and it was with great pleasure I heard remarks to the same effect from Mr Kitto. It is not often I hear such language, but far too frequently laymen are asked to do such and such things because it is customary. Such a reason seems very unworthy. The motive held out should rather be that our Master has said, "If ye do My will, ye shall know of My doctrine." In dealing with laymen, I think many clergy treat religion too much as a matter of course, and their dread of cant seems to make them feel it almost indecent to call

religious motives by their right names. When, however, a man has spent a long life in the consistent pursuit of shams, and finds at last the reality of a life for God, he naturally looks to the minister of the church for evidence of that reality; and if he looks in vain, he can have but little motive for hearty co-operation with such a clergyman in Church work. I sympathise with Canon How in what he said of daily services. I think that when everything seems to go wrong, a daily service helps to quiet one's froward heart, and when all goes well, it helps to make one feel what a joyful and pleasant thing it is to be thankful. I agree that our work should be distinctive, and I would be as "Churchy" as any one would wish me, provided the reality of our work is kept distinctly in view. Not long ago I was speaking with the head of a great Christian institution of the desirability of making it more distinctly Church of England, and the only objection raised was the fear that in doing so it might lose some of that reality which now characterises the institution. I have often heard the clergy complain of the reluctance of the laity to assist them, and especially, because the work they asked them to do was so very insignificant. Now I find that f I want my assistants to work, especially hard for me, I must magnify the importance of the work, and the special capacity of my assistant for it; and I think some clergy would get more lay help if they acted thus. In conclusion, I would say, if they want the advice of their laity, let them avoid asking the advice of a layman upon a question on which they have absolutely, and irrevocably, made up their minds.

The Right Rev. The Bishop of Bangor.

In closing the discussion I should like to address a few words to the Congress on the peculiar difficulties of the Church in Wales; but, before doing so, I wish to express my astonishment that one subject has not been brought forward to-day, as it relates to a sphere of lay usefulness, and is obviously in accordance with the mind of the Church—I mean the subject of sponsors in baptism. Formerly this office was undertaken by God-fearing laymen or the "holy virgins of the Church," and surely it is a high Christian duty to come forward and help the children of those persons who were themselves little likely to bring them up religiously, and to see that they were educated for the Lord, and brought up in His nurture and admonition. I will now proceed to the difficulties of the Church in Wales. The first is the co-existence of two distinct languages, cutting off the upper from the lower classes, and thus making it impossible for those who have most leisure and most inclination to work amongst the masses of the people. The next difficulty is, that amongst the mass of the people themselves a great portion of the most spiritually-minded are already absorbed by other denominations. The Welsh, as a people, are a religious nation. They are an impulsive people, and have great fluency and command of language, and they being naturally disposed to exercise their gifts in that direction have hitherto found it easier to exercise those gifts amongst the Nonconformists than in the Church. My diocese is smaller than that of Carlisle, sparsely inhabited, with large mountain parishes. What we have endeavoured to do of late years has been to scatter through those districts humble and small, but ecclesiastical-looking, buildings in which the Church's services are conducted by the clergyman when he is able to do so, and at other times by lay preachers licensed, and sent forth by the bishop for that purpose. I think it of importance that this licence should be required, because it enables one to see that those who go forth to preach the Word are men of pure and holy lives; and they who are the objects of their care ought to have some security that their teaching and doctrines are recognised by the Church to which they belong. I believe the greatest difficulty young clergymen have in Wales is the want of lay sympathy. I have seen men go into remote parishes full of zeal and earnestness, but who, failing at the beginning of their ministry to elicit any evident response, have gradually relaxed their energy and attention, and have ended by making shipwreck of that character for usefulness, which at the outset of their career seemed to

promise such good results for the Church. In those parishes which are well-worked, there is no difficulty in finding laymen to assist in the Sunday schools and prayer-meetings, and those particular occasions when a number are gathered together. The difficulty is to find persons of leisure and education, able to give more sustained work than persons who are engaged during the day in the ordinary fields of labour. Here it is that the difference of language comes in to interfere so much with our progress. Then another difficulty arises in this way. The lay reader is usually a poor man not able to maintain himself, and who must, therefore, be supported by Church funds in some form. He is abstracted from his secular occupation, but his new work is not permanently secured. He may be thrown out of his engagement, and not be able to get another. These men wish to be ordained to the diaconate, and I am almost inclined to think the needs of the Church require it. But after a time they would desire to press forward to a priesthood; and yet they may be men who, although with some natural gifts, are not equal in education to what we expect and desire in the priests of the Church of England. This is a difficulty which has pressed on my own mind, and prevented me hitherto from acceding to this course. It must not, however, be thought that the position of the Church of Wales is altogether discouraging. Indeed there is no part of the empire where a greater proportion of the people attend divine service, or where the Lord's-day is better observed. I hope that God in His own good time will bring back the scattered sheep to the fold; and that the Church in Wales will take its proper place as possessing the affection of the people; and being a source of strength, and not weakness, to the Church of which it is an integral part.

The President then closed the meeting with the benediction.

THURSDAY MORNING, 7th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. Bishop Hobhouse took the Chair in the Town-Hall, at half-past ten o'clock.

HOW FAR HAS RECENT LEGISLATION PRACTICALLY AFFECTED RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN OUR UNIVERSITIES?

PAPERS.

The Rev. Canon Perowne.

In attempting to give an answer to this question, I shall confine myself to its bearing on my own University of Cambridge. Though the two universities have much in common, and though both have recently been the subject of special legislation, yet each has its own peculiarities of religious thought and religious life—peculiarities which may escape the notice of an outside observer, and which even a resident may find it difficult fairly and fully to portray. I am thankful that the sister University of Oxford is represented by one well qualified to deal with the question now before the Congress in reference to that university. Though many of my remarks may be applicable to both universities, I

must ask the members of the Congress to hold me responsible for their correctness only in reference to the University of Cambridge. In a well-known work of fiction from the pen of the present Prime Minister occurs the following passage: An Oxford Professor is made to observe, "Universities have nothing to do with religion." "I had thought universities were universal," said Lothair, "and had to do with Conigsbury." "I cannot conceive any society of any kind without religion," said the lady. The lady was right.

All Cambridge men are familiar with the phrase applied by every preacher in St Mary's pulpit to the two old universities, when he bids his hearers pray for a blessing on them as "seminaries of sound learning and religious education." It must never be forgotten by Churchmen that the universities and the colleges were intended by their founders to be schools where Christian instruction and secular teaching should be together imparted to the youth of England. The religious character thus stamped upon them in early times was not effaced, but made prominent by the statutes of Queen Elizabeth. From that time to the year 1856, the union between the universities and the Church of England was intimate and exclusive.

Well-nigh all the honours, all the emoluments, all the offices, all the influences, which the University and the Colleges had to bestow were limited to members of the Established Church, while a large share of the more important posts could only be filled by clergymen. Splendidly endowed with rent and tithe and dividend, rich in his loric association, no less rich in intellectual power and the treasures of genius, holding in her hand the higher education of one-half of the middle and upper classes of England, Cambridge had an opportunity, and, therefore, a responsibility which it is not easy to over-estimate. As regards secular learning, she seized upon the opportunity—she faced the responsibility. Bentley and Newton and Porson were bright, intellectual luminaries amid a host of lesser stars. They not only enlightened the generation in which they lived, we still walk in the light of their example and their discoveries. In respect of mathematical science and classical literature, Cambridge has discharged her high trust with fidelity and renown. But Cambridge had a greater work to do than to extend the circle of secular knowledge. She *was* constituted by those whose benefactions she enjoyed, and she herself professed to be a place "of *religious* education." Now it is a common mistake in the present day to identify education with instruction, to suppose that, when you have imparted knowledge to a boy or a young man, you have educated him. But, on the other hand, there can be no true education without instruction, without definite religious teaching. Here, it must be confessed, the University of Cambridge failed to fulfil its mission, to discharge its trust. Religious instruction can be imparted directly and systematically by a college or a university chiefly through the medium of sermons and lectures. Indirect instruction may be given and influence exerted in many other ways. But these are the two great channels through which the streams of Christian truth and heavenly wisdom may be poured into the open ears and willing hearts of our youthful students. I cannot fairly speak of the effect of recent legislation on religious instruction in the universities, without reminding you of what that instruction was before Parliament interposed. First

of all, two sermons were preached in the University Church on Sundays, and one on Festivals. Very few members of the Senate and fewer undergraduates ever attended any but the afternoon sermon on Sundays when the pulpit was (as it still is) occupied by special preachers. These sermons were, many of them, marked by great ability, and dealt with the great theological questions of the day. But this was not the case with all. It sometimes happened (even within my own recollection) that the objections to a doctrine of the Church were more clearly stated than satisfactorily answered, and the difficulties of Scripture sought out and paraded before a youthful audience, when the inability of the preacher to offer a solution tended to suggest the doubt whether any rational solution were possible at all.

In the seventeen College Chapels the undergraduates were rarely called upon to hear sermons. Once a term, when the Holy Communion was administered, it was not uncommon for the Master or Dean to preach. In one or two colleges there were evening sermons regularly or occasionally. In some the ordinance of preaching was wholly neglected.

I pass over the slovenly mode of performing daily service which prevailed in many colleges—the irregular and unpunctual attendance connived at—and so encouraged the unfrequent administration of the Lord's Supper—because the ordinances of the Church though closely linked on to the religious instruction of the place, may be held by some to be means of grace rather than channels of instruction. And yet I am sure (if I may make the remark in passing) that we *do* teach by the mode in which we perform divine service. By slovenliness we may teach irreverence tending to ungodliness—by undue and unauthorised ceremonial we may foster superstition and lead to idolatry. By both we may produce or cherish unbelief.

But it may be supposed that by means of Divinity Lectures the University was doing a great work. The names of Tuston, and Ollivant, and Bhunt, of Corrie, and Jeremie, and Selwyn, will recur to the minds of many here present, and it may be asked whether religious instruction of a higher order could be obtained anywhere, in England, or on the Continent, than was imparted in the lecture-rooms of these distinguished men. To this I reply without hesitation, that the professors of divinity, both in the lecture-room and out of it, might be compared with the teachers of any department of literature or science in Europe, and not suffer by the comparison. But their classes were small, and included but few of the more gifted students—those only who intended to take Holy Orders. The University provided instruction of the highest kind, but the inducements to study theology were wanting, which were abundantly supplied in classics and mathematics. In the colleges the want was still more apparent. Not only were the Scholarships and Fellowships awarded exclusively to proficiency in secular learning, but in most colleges the religious instruction was limited to one lecture a week on a book of the Greek Testament; in some colleges religious instruction was ignored in the lecture-room as well as in the chapel.

Such was the state of things when a rumour reached the University that a commission would shortly be opened to inquire into the condition of the universities and colleges, with a view to extending the benefits of those societies by modifying their constitution. On July 29, 1856, an

Act of Parliament received the Royal Sanction, by which a commission was appointed for the above purpose—in which two things are specially to be noticed. The preamble opens, "Whereas it is expedient for the advancement of religion and learning to enlarge the powers," and so forth. Here we have a recognition by the Legislature that the universities are established and maintained *first* and foremost for the advancement of religion. [Again, out of eight commissioners four were ecclesiastics, two being Bishops, one a Dean, and one an eminent (big) man (now Master of the Temple.)] The changes affecting religious instruction introduced under power conferred by this Act, which took effect about 1858, were mainly these: As regarded the University, all religious tests were abolished, so far as to enable Dissenters or Heathens to take Degrees and become members of the governing body or senate. In colleges no student was thenceforth to be required to make or subscribe to any declaration of his religious belief, or to take any oath on admission to a scholarship or exhibition. Thus persons of any creed, or of no creed, were to enjoy "emoluments provided to Churchmen for the assistance of the Church in their academical education, and the Senate of the University was to be a mixed body, consisting of Churchmen, Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics.

Such a state of things could not continue. If we look at it from a human point of view, we shall say that the enemies of the Church within and outside the University had been testing the Conservatism and the Churchmanship of those interested in the higher education of the country with a view to further aggression. To a Christian mind the thought is suggested that Almighty God was warning us to set our house in order—that He was reminding us of our responsibility which we had too much forgotten or neglected.

Time went on—effort after effort was made to secularise the University and the College. These efforts were frustrated once and again by the vigour and tact of members of the Legislature backed by an influential body of members of the Senate, resident and non-resident. As one who devoted no small amount of time and thought and labour to the defence of the University against the attacks of the Secularists, I can state from my own sad knowledge, that the divorce between the Church and University effected by the Act of 1871 was due not to the assault of enemies without, but to the timid Liberalism of those who held high office and enjoyed rich endowments within the University. Those who ate of her bread, ay, and her delicacies, too, lifted up their heel against her. Instead of asking "What ought we to do?" they inquired "What can we do?" and they betrayed the cause which they were bound by every tie of honour and religion to defend.

The second bill was introduced into Parliament, and became law in June 1871. It was entitled an Act to alter the law respecting religious tests in the universities, &c.

The preamble of this unhappy Act might be taken as a piece of terrible irony. It begins, "Whereas it is expedient that the benefits of the universities and colleges, as places of *religion* (mark, religion is ever uppermost in the thoughts of these reformers) and learning, should be rendered freely accessible to all the nation. And whereas, by means of divine restriction, tests, and disabilities, many of Her Majesty's subjects are debarred from the same." It then goes on to abolish tests, and remove disabilities

"under proper safeguards for the maintenance of religious instruction and worship in the said universities and colleges." By the Act of 1858, many clerical fellowships had been thrown open to laymen. By the Act of 1871, all lay fellowships, all professorships, except the four Divinity Professorships, and all offices in the University and the several colleges, were made tenable by graduates of the University without any regard to their religious belief. The Act was not to interfere with the lawfully established system of religious instruction, worship, and discipline—indeed, the governing body in every college was to do what was never done before, and what the Act itself renders in many cases impossible—it was to provide sufficient religious instruction for all members thereof in *statu pupillari* belonging to the Established Church. But curiously enough it is ordered that "no person shall be required to attend any college lecture to which he, if he be of full age, or if he be not of full age, his parent or guardian, shall object on religious grounds." It is not difficult to see that this last conscience clause virtually strikes at the root of all religious instruction and all discipline. That either the one or the other is actually maintained is due to the fact that the good sense of the middle classes of England stops often short of that excess of riot to which Liberal legislation invites them to run. Practically I believe that few are foolish enough to avail themselves (much less to claim) the exemption to which they are legally entitled. Let me, in conclusion, state how far the Christian instruction of the University—in its twofold form of sermon and lecture—has been affected by recent legislation.

1st, University sermons continue much as they were before the passing of the Act of 1871. A party in the University have introduced to St Mary's pulpit preachers who are not members of the University of Cambridge at all—not, it may be presumed, from any want of Cambridge theologians—but on other grounds. Everything is done to attract an audience, too little to supply sound religious instruction. If the modern Cambridge pulpit is not what it once was, may it not be so because the aim of those whose duty it is to appoint preachers is *too low*. It cannot be termed a direct result of recent legislation, that in many colleges a sermon has been introduced as part of this regular service on Sunday mornings. In some cases the practice was adopted before the passing of the Act. In others it has not yet been commenced. In at least two colleges it has been tried and discontinued. And why should it not be discontinued everywhere? Once have a majority of the governing body of a college political Dissenters—and sermons would immediately be abolished. It does not require a majority for this end. The irreligious Churchman may be expected to agree with the enemy of the Church, in an impatience of sound Church-teaching.

I cannot say that any great change has taken place in the theological teaching of the university or the colleges in *consequence of* recent enactments. Those enactments are terribly potential for evil. For any good end they are simply powerless. Everything that is valuable that we now have, we might have had before the passing of the two Acts of Parliament. They have positively done nothing but introduce a disturbing force into our societies, the evil effects of which only time can fully show.

One curious result of recent legislation may be mentioned to show how

the Church of this country is treated with indignity under the new conditions of university life. It was thought desirable a few years ago to establish a theological tripos. As a student taking a place on this tripos would be entitled to the B.A. Degree, and as the B.A. Degree had been thrown open to all persons of any or no creed, a difficulty arose as to the subjects of examination. One would have thought that the formularies of the National Church might have appeared in the schedules of subjects of examination. Will it be believed that this was declared illegal? For the Liturgy of the Church of England, *Liturgiology* (a word coined for the occasion, whatever it may mean) was substituted, while the Thirty-nine Articles were subordinated to the Confessions of the sixteenth century. It is fair to add—and should be generally known—that neither the Koran nor the Book of Mormon are introduced with special reference to Holy Scripture.

To sum up: The outworks with which the piety and wisdom of our forefathers encircled our fortress of Christian truth, have been betrayed and thrown down. We can fight no longer behind the ramparts of statutes and tests and safeguards. We must meet the enemy in the open field. Or, to change the metaphor—the breakwater which kept out the mad waves of the spring-tide has been taken away, and when the tide of false doctrine or heresy rages and swells, we must face its fury as best we may. This, at any rate, is certain—God in His mercy has left us much that is worth preserving, much that we may use for His honour and the setting forth of His truth. But He has punished us for past unfaithfulness by removing the safeguards with which He had shielded us, and has taught us to trust not on men or on institutions, but on Him alone for the maintenance of His cause. And it may be that our universities may yet be honoured as His instruments for the diffusion of Christian truth and Christian influence, if we as individuals own and repent of past neglect, and henceforth "be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain which are ready to die."

Christian parents and guardians, and Churchmen, generally, must require of our college authorities what Dissenters enjoy in their several seminaries—systematic religious teaching in the chapel and the lecture-room. A college must not be selected solely for the place its boat occupies on the river, or the scholarships which it has to bestow, or the pleasant society to be found there. If a pressure for good from outside be brought to bear on the universities as strong as that which has influenced them for evil, allies will not be wanting within who will combine for the maintenance in these venerable institutions of Christian influence and sound religious instruction.

Above all, let Churchmen supply in private and family devotions that one deficiency of our Litany, and pray that the Great Head of the Church will make and keep us faithful to Him, and sources of light and blessing to England and England's sons now and for all generations.

The Rev. W. Ince.

The exact question proposed for our consideration is "How far has recent legislation practically affected Religious Instruction in our Universities?" I shall be excused if in handling this subject I confine what I have to say almost exclusively to the University of Oxford, with which I am most familiar, and of the condition of which I may claim to speak from some experience, having now held office as a College Tutor longer than any other resident in Oxford. Nor will the general discussion suffer by such limitation, inasmuch as a speaker amply competent by position and knowledge will give information of the state of things in the University of Cambridge.

We shall do well, in the first instance, to recall to our memories what have been the actual changes introduced by the most recent legislation affecting the universities so far as they bear upon the question of religion. These are chiefly contained in the Universities Test Act of 1871. That Act gives a large amount of liberty to individuals. It expressly releases all graduates (other than those in divinity) and all holders of offices such as fellowships, tutorships, scholarships, and exhibitions, from any obligation to subscribe any article or formulary of faith, or to conform to any religious observance, or to attend any form of public worship, or to belong to any specified Church, sect, or denomination; but at the same time, the Act carefully recognises the colleges in their corporate capacity as places of religion as well as of learning. It declares in express words the expediency of providing proper safeguards for the maintenance of religious instruction and worship. It provides that nothing in the Act shall interfere otherwise than is expressly enacted with the system of religious instruction, worship, and discipline already existing; and further enacts that the governing body of every college subsisting at the time of passing the Act, shall provide sufficient religious instruction for all members thereof *in statu pupillari* belonging to the Established Church, and that the Morning and Evening Prayer according to the order of the Book of Common Prayer, or an abridgment or adaptation of the same, authorised by the visitor of the college, shall continue to be used daily as heretofore. The general result of all these legislative enactments is to recognise public worship and religious instruction according to the principles of the Church of England as the normal rule for the colleges, with liberal conscience clauses in reference to individual members, for no person is to be compelled to attend the public worship of any Church, sect, or denomination to which he does not belong, nor to attend any college or university lecture to which he or his parent or guardian shall object upon religious grounds.

As a matter of fact, the changes thus legalised by the Tests Act have had comparatively little influence. Most of the modifications of religious discipline and teaching which are viewed with displeasure (whether reasonable or not I will not undertake to say) by older members of the University, were introduced at Oxford before the passing of the Tests Act.

Let me speak first of attendance on the services in the College Chapel. The Oxford University Reform Act of 1854 first opened the University

to Nonconformists, by abrogating the necessity of subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, on matriculation, or on taking the degree of B.A. The number of Nonconformists who resorted to Oxford was very small, as might naturally be expected when the endowments were not open to them, but if they objected on religious grounds, they had a dispensation from attendance at chapel. As time went on, much discussion arose upon the question of the expediency of continuing the old practice of compulsory attendance at chapel. Some maintained that undergraduates being still *in statu pupillari*, were rightly subjected to such a discipline of religious influence, just in the same way as boys at a public school, or as members of a household gathered at family prayers. Others thought that young men varying in age from eighteen to twenty-three or twenty-four, should be left entirely free to attend or abstain from attending college chapel as their own religious impulses might dictate. The result was that about ten years ago one college made attendance at chapel perfectly voluntary, and others subsequently followed the precedent. But this alteration of system has been tried under very varying conditions. In some colleges a roll-call was instituted as an alternative with college chapel, in order that absence from chapel might not have a premium put upon it by its encouragement of a self-indulgent habit of lying in bed till a late hour; in others no such alternative was required. At the present time I believe that attendance at chapel is left optional in four or five colleges, though in three at least of these a roll-call requiring attendance some thirty or forty mornings each term is enforced; in the other colleges attendance at chapel is required within certain limits, and is urged by admonition and expostulation. A doubt has arisen whether such attendance may be enforced as a rule of discipline. It is perfectly clear by the Tests Act that no undergraduate could be compelled to attend chapel *as a condition of retaining any scholarship or exhibition*, but it seems to me that any undergraduate member of the Established Church may still lawfully be required to attend the services of the college chapel as a part of religious instruction, worship, and discipline. All that the Act prescribes is that no one shall be compelled to attend the public worship of any Church to which he does not belong. And the abridged form of service which is now introduced into most colleges occupying not more than a quarter of an hour, has removed some of the objections which were commonly urged against the old system on the grounds of tediousness and monotony.

I pass now to the subject of divinity lectures and examinations. These I believe to have been in no appreciable way affected by the passing of the Tests Act. A great deal of popular misapprehension exists on this subject. I have within the last two or three years repeatedly been asked by men of high position and culture in London and elsewhere, whether Oxford has not excluded divinity altogether from its examination for the ordinary degree. The suspicion is wholly unfounded. Every student is bound to offer for examination at moderations the four gospels in Greek, and is questioned minutely both in the text and the subject-matter; and before he is qualified for the B.A. degree, he must have passed an examination in "the Rudiments of Faith and Religion," *i.e.*, the Books of the Old and New Testaments, the gospels and Acts (in Greek), and the Thirty-nine Articles, though for these last may be substituted an epistle or a portion of Church history. At the same time there is a liberal conscience clause.

Any one who objects *on religious grounds* to this examination in the rudiments of faith and religion, is allowed to substitute prescribed portions of secular books or subjects, such as Aristotle's Rhetoric, or an elementary treatise on political economy or natural philosophy. I have ascertained on official authority that the number of undergraduates claiming the right of such substitution on religious grounds has never exceeded twelve in one year, while the enormous majority varying from 300 to 400 still present themselves for the accustomed divinity examination, the standard of which is, I honestly believe, higher than it used to be in old time, as it is now conducted by a separate board of examiners, and examiners are no longer subject to the strong pressure of pity put upon them when failure to pass in divinity inevitably involved in many cases irretrievable failure in obtaining honours in other departments of study.

The provision made for instruction in religious knowledge varies in the several colleges, and can hardly, I fear, be considered as satisfactory in all. The Tests Act requires the governing body of every college to provide sufficient religious instruction for all members *in statu pupillari* belonging to the Established Church. Of that sufficiency each college is left to be judge. In one of the largest colleges all first year men attend a lecture in the gospels for two hours a week during two out of the three terms of the year, and all second and third year men attend a divinity lecture twice a week in one term, and are instructed individually by their tutors during a second term. Instruction in divinity has been much less affected by Parliamentary legislation than by the multiplication of examinations within the university itself, which has tended to limit the subjects of lecture and the amount of time assigned to them by the requirements of the schools and the immediate approach of an examination. The result has been that lectures on the epistles of the New Testament, or on such books as Butler's "Analogy," Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ," Davison on "Prophecy," have almost wholly ceased. Of course I am speaking of the studies of the ordinary mass of undergraduates.

The new honour school of theology established in 1870 has since its foundation had an annual average of thirty-six students, who have obtained classes in it, besides many candidates who have failed to obtain a place. For the instruction of these professed theologians there are available the lectures of the five theological professors and a series of combined lectures by a considerable body of college tutors and lecturers, embracing nearly all the subjects prescribed for the school by the board of theological studies. The school is still in its infancy, and gradually growing in strength, and is undoubtedly at present inadequately provided for in many of the colleges. It seems only reasonable to ask that at least one tutor or lecturer in each college should be assigned for the superintendence of such students as devote themselves in their last two years to theological study. It must not, however, be forgotten, that in the introduction of all new honour schools it is hard to adjust and harmonise the university and the college system of instruction.

In view of the facts to which I have called your attention, I believe that I am justified in asserting that the direct practical effect of recent legislation on religious instruction in the University of Oxford has been comparatively small. The recognition of this may serve to allay unreasonable alarms and refute unfounded charges. But it would be an

unfair and one-sided representation of the matter, if I were to content myself with this statement and omit to notice and account for the vast change which has passed over Oxford during the last thirty years,—a change commented upon with triumph by those who are often called the advanced thinkers of the age; with bitter scorn by the Ultramontane opponents of liberal education, and with profound sorrow by many of the oldest and most devoted sons of Oxford. It is undoubtedly true that the whole intellectual atmosphere of Oxford has changed. The theological element is no longer in the ascendant, as it was in earlier days. The great Church movement beginning in 1833, which is indissolubly linked with the name of Oxford, stirred the whole university. It attracted to itself most of the noble spirits in the different colleges. Setting out of sight altogether the enormous effect produced by that movement upon the religious life of the Church and the nation at large, its moral and intellectual result within the university was incalculable. It kindled devotion, self-sacrifice, studiousness: it discouraged sensuality, self-indulgence, idleness. There was a sharp contrast between the young Tractarian tutor and the old port wine drinking fellow. The new literary interest became, however, almost exclusively theological. Theology coloured all the lectures on philosophy and history. Those were the days when Frederick Oakeley of Balliol wrote his "Remarks upon Aristotelian and Platonic Ethics," one object of which was to show the congeniality and coincidence between the Aristotelian views of ethics and politics, and the peculiar temper which the Church of England best loves, and to exhibit the Reformed Catholic system of the Church of England as the precise exemplification of Aristotle's "mean excellence," and when William Sewell of Exeter wrote his brilliant "Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato," to present Plato as the great opponent of sophistry, scepticism, and dissent, and the great teacher of "Church principles." Such methods of treatment were liable to the danger of being historical anachronisms, by attempting to transplant modern ideas into ancient language.

The excitement of the theological movement had abated within twenty years. New agencies were at work. Other subjects of study than the old classics and mathematics claimed formal recognition. The new ordinances given to most of the colleges in 1853 or 1854, removed the restriction of taking Holy Orders from many of the fellowships, and the university itself, in 1853, introduced two new honour schools, those of law and modern history, and of natural science. Most marked results followed these changes. The presence of many able and accomplished professors and tutors whose main interest lay in non-theological studies, and the popularity of the new schools with a large number of undergraduates, made the colleges become far less clerical seminaries, and far more places of general education. At the same time the manner of pursuing the older literary and classical studies was considerably modified. The examination was directed less to authors than to subjects. Papers were set generally on moral and political philosophy, and on Greek and Roman history; and the comparative methods of study which had begun to make such rapid progress were adopted. The history of philosophy was introduced, and Greek and Roman history were treated in connection with other forms of ancient civilisation.

This accounts for the changed treatment of old subjects. It is not, for example, that Greek ethical philosophy has been of purpose severed from Christianity, or put in antagonism to it. It is treated in its place in the history of human thought in reference to what preceded and what succeeded. It is compared with other systems. It is not offered as a faultless rule for our modern life. The method of treatment has its dangers, but surely it is scientifically and historically far more correct than the older method which it replaced. A Christian teacher may treat morals thus historically without forfeiting or concealing his own faith or his own obedience to the Christian code of morals, and without conveying to his pupils the impression that he advises them to rule their own lives by the precepts of Plato or Aristotle, or J. S. Mill, rather than by those of the Sermon on the Mount. It is undoubtedly and unhappily true, that among resident graduates, some few of whom hold educational offices, as also among the undergraduates, there are found some who hold sceptical and Anti-Christian views, but the responsibility for this is not to be laid upon the university, nor upon recent Parliamentary legislation. It must be obvious to all thinking men that a wave of scepticism and infidelity, entire or partial, is sweeping over all Christian countries. The writings of many modern philosophers, physiologists, physicists, and critics, have shaken belief in the primary truths of Theism as well as of Christianity. Of course these intellectual influences have reached the universities, but it is unjust to lay the blame upon them. I am confident that materialistic or sceptical views are far more current and openly avowed in London society than in the university. Books and reviews, far more than oral teaching, are responsible for the shaking of faith. Works like those of Renan and Strauss, and the author of "Supernatural Religion," and anti-Christian articles in the Fortnightly and similar reviews, are read in the Oxford "Union;" but so they are also in the libraries of London clubs, and in the studies of the boys of the upper forms of our great public schools before they come to the universities. That there is generally prevalent among the tutors and lecturers now resident in Oxford an aggressive and proselytising spirit of infidelity, which colours their public teaching, and makes them insinuate in their lectures doubts of the great truths of Theism and Christianity, I wholly disbelieve. I am certain that some whose views may have become perplexed or shaken are far too unhappy in their own minds to wish to impart their own unhappiness to others. I will not deny that there may have been within the last ten years two or three exceptions, but we ought to be very careful of confounding the utterances of private tutors or writers with the public teaching of accredited college lecturers, or of generalising from very exceptional and isolated instances.

The social life of the university in its intellectual and religious aspects is now far more complex and varied than it has probably ever before been. Amongst the undergraduates you have one great body whose heart's interest is concentrated upon athletics, or boating, or cricketing, and whose intellectual ardour is confined to attaining the bare minimum of knowledge sufficient to satisfy examiners, and who view all religious questions, whether as between Christianity and atheism, or High and Low Church, as totally uninteresting. They acquiesce in the tradition of their early years. There is another large body, intellectual, clever, industrious, yet sometimes flippant and dogmatic, who read authors like Mill and Herbert

Spencer, and Bain or Darwin, and Tyler and Lubbock, and hold keen debate on these in club or wine party, or essay society, and drawing inferences fair or unfair from what they have read, question whether there is or is not adequate evidence for the existence of God and a supra-sensual world, and for the distinction between mind and matter, and for a supernatural origin of religion and morality, and for the credibility of the early patriarchal history of the Book of Genesis, or the miraculous element in the gospel narrative. And then there is another large section, numbering perhaps between 400 and 500, who are more or less interested in religious matters, widely divergent in opinion, often intolerant, sometimes inconsistent, yet for the most part earnest and devout; some delighting in elaborate ceremonialism, others engaging themselves in evangelistic labours; many of them members of various associations for devotional, missionary, or philanthropic purposes, thankful for theological guidance and instruction, and glad to talk over their difficulties with any sympathising senior. Nor, alas! in addition to all these classes, is there wanting in such a mixed society the class of the idle and vicious.

The same diversified tendencies are found among the graduates, some being wholly immersed in literary and scientific study, and standing aloof from all theological questions; others jealous of any theological or clerical influence, and whatever their private opinions may be, looking upon a secular system of education as the only practicable and desirable form to be adopted by colleges in the future. A very scanty number, hardly I should say amounting to half-a-dozen, has professedly given up the name of Christian. And besides all these groups, there is a very considerable body of tutors and lecturers who are anxious to do their educational work in a definitely religious spirit, who are sincerely anxious for the religious welfare of their pupils, thirty or forty of whom meet together every term for common counsel and discussion on points which may help them in their work, and for common worship; who so far as their influence is concerned would resist all attempts to introduce a purely secular system. The picture of university life is not, as some would draw it, wholly dark: it has its bright lights as well as its shadows. The Oxford of to-day is not wholly given up to rationalism and infidelity. It retains no small elements of a living and sincere Christianity. There are weekly celebrations of Holy Communion in six or seven of the college chapels: it is no unusual thing for meetings of religious societies to have an attendance of eighty or one hundred undergraduates. Four colleges have missionary societies of their own members. The newly-founded college in Oxford conducted on the most avowedly religious system, stands already fourth in the whole university in regard of the number of its undergraduates.

In the university, as in all society, there are perils threatening Christian faith and practice. The true way to endeavour to meet them is not by laying the blame upon Acts of Parliament, or the new ordinances of colleges, nor by unreasoning tirades against natural science or Biblical criticism, but by Christian argument and Christian evidence in books, and, as I venture to urge, most strongly in sermons delivered in college chapels. A strong resistance ought to be offered to the attempt now vigorously made to reduce the present number of clerical fellowships. Public opinion of Churchmen ought to be brought to bear upon such colleges as have hitherto been negligent to fulfil their plain legal obligation to provide

sufficient religious instruction, and further to consider the wants of their theological students. A great opportunity is now open to Christian teachers in the universities. In view of the vast range of subjects studied, a pressing duty lies upon them, if I may quote words of Dr Westcott spoken at a Church Congress three years ago, "to bring within the scope of theology new thoughts and modes of thinking which have not yet been co-ordinated with the faith, and to do so by lifting them up to a region above all personal conflicts or interests." As preachers, if they will set before them the actual wants of the undergraduates, they may render them most valuable service by helping them amid the strife of controversy, and they will find a most loyal and affectionate response to their efforts. And by personal influence and example they can confirm their teaching. If one of the most grievous hindrances to the attempt to inspire religious principles and habits of life into undergraduates is the habitual absence of their instructors from the common public worship of Prayer and Holy Communion in chapel, so also the example of manly, sincere piety, free from the extravagance or ostentation of partisanship, will silently work its results, and add weight to the teaching of the pulpit or the lecture-room. And those who are thus fighting the battle of faith within the precincts of the universities may fairly claim to be sustained from without by the cordial sympathy and support of Christian parents, and all lovers of our old academic institutions, and not to be chilled by distrust and suspicion, which serve only to paralyse their efforts and sadden their hearts.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. W. A. Spooner, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford.

The question at first hearing seems to be one of the simplest kind, but questions of fact are proverbially difficult to decide, and there appear to me to be two special points which add peculiar difficulty to the determining of this particular question; first, the legislation has been so recent that it is exceedingly difficult to determine as yet what its effects will be; and, secondly, it is exceedingly hard to distinguish between the effects of legislation and effects due to other causes. It is very hard to disentangle this question. How much of the supposed or real religious infidelity of our universities is due to the effect of the passing of the Tests Act? from the question—How much is due to the tide of feeling which has been sweeping, not only over England, but over the whole of Europe? For I suppose that few will doubt that this time has been one of unusual religious excitement, an age probably such as has scarcely occurred since the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century, and, in the case of our English Universities, any strong tide of feeling that sweeps over the country is sure to be reproduced and even exaggerated. This is eminently the case with regard to this question of religious speculation. If we look anywhere about us, we shall see how rife religious speculation is. The very existence of such Congresses as this—almost all the discussions in which you have been engaged this week—bear testimony to the fundamental questions which are everywhere being discussed, and to the eagerness with which the people of England are looking for an answer to them. Now, if this is the spirit of the time, it is only natural that it should find an echo in our universities, and not only natural, but even desirable, for where can such questions be

more properly discussed than in the comparative peace and quiet of a university? I feel sure that Oxford would be failing in its proper function if, while these questions affecting the highest interests of religion were being discussed elsewhere, Oxford should be silent upon them. I am thankful to say that this is not the case. The interest in all religious questions felt throughout the country has not failed to produce its effect on Oxford. I do not mean to say that it is desirable these questions should be forced upon the attention of those who are brought to us for instruction, and who, we might hope, would never be disturbed by them; but I think the passing of the Tests Act has tended to diminish the virulence of any religious feeling, and detract from its amount in this way—while, before this Act came into operation men often signed, when young, declarations of belief to which they only half assented, and then, finding themselves in a false position, made declarations of disbelief, in which they only half believed; now, there is removed from those who are in doubt any feeling of having placed themselves in a false position, and so long as their doubts continue they desist from pressing them upon the attention of those with whom they are brought into contact. Then, again, a spirit of chivalry was often excited in the minds of young men in favour of those who seemed to have suffered loss by the deprivation of positions to which their talents otherwise entitled them, by the honest avowal of their convictions. This often created a falsely sentimental feeling in favour of disbelief; but with the abolition of tests this feeling has, to a great extent, disappeared, so that I think all those accounts which represent the whole of Oxford as given up to disbelief in Christianity have been exaggerated or mistaken. Still, there are no doubt dangers to be faced, but if faced they will speedily disappear. It has been already pointed out to you that the Tests Act has provided for the religious education in colleges of those who are sent to colleges. No doubt if those giving instruction are themselves uninterested in religious questions, such religious education is likely to be of comparatively little value, but the remedy rests with the parents of those who send their sons to college. If they would insist [as the law has given them a perfect right, and by giving them the right has imposed upon them a duty to do] that their sons shall receive that education in the principles of the Church of England which they themselves so greatly value, then you may be quite sure that the colleges will not commit suicide by depriving themselves of their best customers. There is another danger on which I would say a word; it may seem fanciful, but I think it is real. There seems to be a danger of a system of denominational colleges arising within our universities. To a certain extent our colleges have always been denominational—I mean denominational within the limits of the Church of England. Some of them were founded to promote particular views or lines of thought. Christ Church, for instance, was founded in the days of the Reformation, to promote the interests of the Reformation and the new learning. St John's, we know, was greatly enlarged to give weight in the university to the principles which Archbishop Laud wished to inculcate; and in more recent times colleges have been to a considerable extent denominational in this way, that people in choosing them have naturally chosen those where the form of religion with which they most strongly sympathise was most largely taught. Most people know that for many years Wadham was the favourite home of Low Churchmen, and Exeter the chief resort of High Churchmen. Balliol, if I might style Scotchmen a denomination, was chiefly addicted to that denomination. While such a principle of natural selection as this is desirable, and I hope will long continue, it would be a great disaster if any distinctively denominational system were introduced. Keble College, with which in many ways I sympathise very much, has set the example of being the first distinctively denominational college founded in Oxford. I trust the example thus set will not greatly spread—that colleges will not drift into the hands of different denominations—that some colleges will not become the homes of free thought, while others are chosen solely by those who wish for the maintenance of the principles of the Church of England. I can imagine few greater evils than this would be to the universities, and to England at large, for it is the fact that hitherto England has escaped that great danger, into which so many foreign nations have drifted, of being divided into two widely severed and mutually repellent

camps, one consisting of all those who believe anything, the other consisting of those who believe nothing. The best hope for our escape from this danger is that within the limits of our universities, questions, even of the deepest moment in religion, should be freely discussed, that those who believe should leaven those who disbelieve, and then we may well hope that the record of moderation which England has hitherto shown will not less in the future be handed down to our descendants.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, M.A.

Everything with regard to the work of God at our Universities depends, so far as human effort is concerned, upon the believing and united prayers of God's people throughout the country; and I think we have made wonderful progress within the last hundred years. I have in my possession a pamphlet by the celebrated George Whitfield, remonstrating with the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford of that day against the iniquity of expelling six of the best men of St Edmund's Hall for no other offence than that of meeting for extempore prayer; and Whitfield says that as judgment had begun at the house of God, he hopes the University will go on and expel men for extempore swearing, which was much more common than extempore prayer. What a contrast to that is the present state of things! Not very long ago at Cambridge, when Mr S. A. Blackwood went down to give an address at the Town Hall, there were not many undergraduates present at first, because the men had not come from the boats; but when they came up from the boats (I have the testimony of a fellow of a college, who, I am sure, would not exaggerate), there were not less than 800 undergraduates assembled to hear him. We could not, perhaps, get such an assembly at Oxford gathered together for the same purpose; but I may just mention that last term I wished a number of my friends to hear an earnest address on holiness and entire devotion to the service of Jesus Christ, and the only thing I could do to secure this was to get them to make use of the short time between the end of morning chapel at 8.30 and the morning lectures at 10. I asked every man who had been introduced to me to breakfast, and we had 126 men who listened with the most earnest attention to this address on holiness and entire devotion to the service of Christ. As I looked down three long tables of undergraduates, I did not see one face that was not interested more or less. Then I may tell you that a number of undergraduates come together every Saturday evening at my own rectory for the purpose of prayer and exposition of the Word of God. There were Greek Testament classes held after the evening service on Sundays by Mr Burgon and Mr Barlow. There is every reason to trust and pray that God will bless those who are endeavouring to bring His truth to the hearts of undergraduates. I was very thankful to learn that at Cambridge Professors Lightfoot and Westcott can be seen on certain evenings in the week by any undergraduates who have doubts and difficulties. Some years ago I became acquainted with a number of earnest undergraduates who were more or less shaken in faith; but they had not given up their belief in the truth that God answers prayer. One of them, who became a first-classman, told me that his faith was shaken to the foundation; but nevertheless at their meetings they always began with prayer, and afterwards went into all the difficulties suggested to their minds, and the best answers they could obtain. As a matter of fact, every mmber of that

society is now a faithful and valuable clergyman of the Church of England, except one, who died before he realised his purpose of obtaining ordination. Of that society three are first-classmen, and ten are second-classmen; most of them are incumbents, and those who are not ought to be. It is another encouraging fact that whereas in former days it used to be thought a sin for a layman to preach, I was invited to Cambridge some time ago when Bishop Harold Browne was Bishop of Ely, to address the Cambridge Undergraduates' Open-air Mission; and I found in the afternoon, when men are usually taking their exercise, a large number of undergraduates gathered together at a meeting, with the Bishop in the chair; and I there learnt that there were open-air services held in the market-place and other open spaces in Cambridge with the sanction of the Bishop and the Proctors of the University, and the encouragement of certain incumbents. At those services many of these University men preached the gospel to all who would hear it; undergraduates began the service with singing, and then preached with all their hearts Jesus to those who gathered round them.

The Ven. Archdeacon Reichel.

I should have preferred being a hearer to being a speaker at this meeting, but it has been thought by some members of the Congress that it would be as well to hear a voice from the sister University of Dublin. What that University has suffered from recent legislation cannot, I am sure, be uninteresting to an English Congress, seeing that many of the English clergy, some of whom occupy most influential positions in the Church, have taken their degree in Dublin. I know comparatively little of the inner life of that University at the present moment, because I have long ceased to be a resident there, although a member of the Council. That body cannot interfere with the divinity faculty as such; it has no share in the appointment of professors of divinity, nor can it model the course of religious instruction which may be given in the divinity school. The present state of things in the University of Dublin, caused by the introduction and passing of Mr Fawcett's Act in 1873, is that all tests are swept away with regard to the holding of any office of emolument, except in the case of the Regius Professor of Divinity, Archbishop King's Divinity Lecturer, and the Professorship of Biblical Greek. This last professorship is now vacant, and perhaps may be never filled up; therefore there are at present only two offices in the University of Dublin which involve any recognition of Christianity, and the appointment to these offices is made by the Provost and seven senior Fellows of Trinity College, in whom has been vested, up to last November, the whole government, not merely of the College, but also of the University, which is distinct from the college, although the fact has been forgotten by many members of the University. This state of things is a very serious peril, as it seems to me. I am not going to speak ill of my own University; but I fear that the tendency of things there is not merely to free thought in the meaning of unshackled thought, but to free thought in the sense of invitation to scepticism—not free thought in the shape of inquiry, but free thought in the shape of doubt. This one fact, I think, will confirm my fear—for the last seven years not a single Fellow of Trinity College has taken holy orders; and it has become a serious question how, in the future, when the present fellows in holy orders are dead, the services in the college chapel will be carried on. It has been hinted,

with regard to the University of Oxford, that it would be desirable that a certain number of fellows should be required to take holy orders. I do not know whether the regulations of the colleges can so far supersede the evident intentions of the Test Act as to enable them to carry out anything of the kind; but if they are not absolutely compelled to render it necessary for a certain number of their fellows to take holy orders, I cannot conceive how in the long run they can do it. Except in the case of a college wholly devoted to the Church of England, like Keble College, it will altogether depend upon the temporary mind of the college whether such a rule will be passed; and then what will become of the religious teaching? You who live in England cannot be aware of the full nature of our conflict in Ireland with a tremendous enemy—an enemy well armed at all points and perfectly unscrupulous in carrying out her ends—the Church of Rome. How far scepticism has penetrated amongst the higher classes of Romanists in Ireland I cannot say, because the line of demarcation between Protestant and Roman Catholic is becoming more marked every day, and intercourse between them on these subjects seems to have utterly ceased. We are therefore perfectly in the dark as to what is working in the minds of educated Roman Catholics; but I greatly fear that that wave of scepticism which began in France and Germany, and after a long interval has passed over England, will at length reach Ireland; and then perhaps we shall find ourselves face to face with an enemy which we shall not be able to meet, not having taken any effectual measures to do so. In conclusion, I am going to say something which will probably be very unpopular, but you will pardon me on account of my age—it is as to the prevalence of these debating and discussing societies in the Universities. I confess I think that undergraduates are at college for the purpose of learning, and not for the purpose of settling by anticipation questions of enormous consequence, to decide on which involves an amount of information, and requires a maturity of judgment which it is utterly impossible for boys between eighteen and three-and-twenty to possess. If there is to be safety for the future, there must be some principle of authority in the University with regard to these matters; and I fear that principle of authority is shaken by the prevalence of debate amongst young men.

The Rev. V. H. Stanton.

As a resident fellow in the University of Cambridge, I am thankful to be allowed to say a few words on this subject. I take a very different view of the general condition of things, and the general effect of legislation, from that represented by Dr Perowne. He has said that these Acts have been terribly potential for evil. I agree entirely with what has been said by the representatives of the University of Oxford, that they could not have had any evil effect in themselves. It is not on any Act that the condition of a University can depend. It must depend on the general state of the country, and the general condition of thought. So long as the classes who send their sons to the University desire that they shall be religiously educated, we who desire the religious education of those sons will carry it out. So long as the Church of England looks for the great body of her ministers to the Universities, we shall be able to provide a theological training for them. It must plainly be the case. Let us consider both lines of change which have taken place—first, as affecting the governing body at large by changing the

body of voters through the abolition of tests; secondly, the influence on the management of colleges both by the abolition of tests and the diminution of clerical fellowships. Does anybody, I would ask, believe that Jews, Mohammedans, or infidels of any kind, can influence our councils, while they are a small minority in the nation, and especially while they are in a small minority among those who go to the Universities? When Jews, Mohammedans, and infidels are the main body of the nation, that will be the case; but until then, the Universities will be religious just as any other body in England is religious. Again, even supposing a large proportion of the fellows of a college were at any time sceptical, so long as a large number of men come to the Universities wishing for a theological training, the authorities in the college (as has been observed by Mr Spooner) will be forced to provide religious instruction for them, for the sake of keeping up their college. Therefore it is a very great pity for us so entirely to look to the wrong cause as to think that it is legislation that does everything, whereas it is to the general condition of the nation, and the general spiritual efficiency of the Church, that we must look for the change we want. Now, what is really the case? According to the testimony of all the speakers, there has been a great improvement in the condition of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. It is very important that this united testimony should go forth to the country, because the impression that has got about is an exceedingly false one, and it is one of those prophecies which are likely to fulfil themselves. Therefore, I say, be hopeful: be courageous, as every Christian man and woman should be, and then we shall succeed far more than we shall if these doleful prophecies are uttered. At the present time there is in Cambridge a really great religious movement, which I would venture to compare with the last religious movement in Oxford, though I think it is a wiser movement, and one likely to be of a more efficient character. We have among the number of our professors of divinity men capable of influencing the very highest intellects, and of sending forth pupils who will influence the world as much as the disciples of Newman and Pusey did. All those old institutions which were started by the great Evangelical revival which flowed forth from Cambridge, and which was the first tide of reawakening in the English Church, are in full efficiency, and have enormously increased in efficiency within the last few years; and, in addition to these, there are new elements of a very valuable kind. There is, for instance, the Cambridge University Church Society, though I would not have mentioned it, because I am intimately connected with it, unless I had been requested to say something about it. It is of this character—it consists of communicants of the Church of England who are members of the University, who join together in devotional services, and discuss questions such as those which are brought before Church Congresses, for the sake of stimulating men to undertake Christian work in after-life, and also for the purpose of abolishing the differences between Churchmen, and teaching them to look to their Church instead of to any party in it as their centre of union. By this means some men have had their views very much enlarged, and I believe their efficiency in future life will be greatly increased. It has also been a channel for the most intelligent Christians in the University for exercising their influence on those excellent, pious, and zealous young men who are often deficient in wisdom and knowledge of the general state of thought.

The Ven. Archdeacon Emery.

As representing the University of Cambridge, through having been resident in it since I left a public school in 1843 practically to the present moment, I am glad to be allowed to say two or three words. From my going up to Cambridge, and certainly from the time of taking my degree in 1847, I have been very intimately connected with most of the religious movements in Cambridge, and I was promoted to the archdeaconry of Ely, not from a living but from being a tutor in a college where Dr Perowne was a fellow-tutor. It seems to me that I may act as moderator between Dr Perowne and Mr Stanton. Dr Perowne represents the strong feeling of many University men of long experience; Mr Stanton is a young and able representative of the newly-developed religious life in Cambridge. Both are right. I feel with Dr Perowne that certain evils have resulted, and more may possibly result, from past legislation; but I agree with Mr Stanton that, on the whole, we need not fear; that there has been a vast advance in religious feeling—in religious feeling founded upon reasonable evidence and open discussion of Christian faith, and that, therefore, even though we have lost, as it were, the protection of the old state of things, we need not despair as to the religious condition of the University of Cambridge; nor, as we have heard from Mr Ince, of the religious condition of the University of Oxford. We may not like—I did not like, I confess—the new Act of Parliament doing away with the tests; I did not like the doing away with the distinct Church of England character of the University; but I maintain now that that Act of Parliament, which did away with the tests, did not do away with the religious basis of education in the University, the preamble being in order to promote more religion in the University. And I do not think it has done away even with the distinctively Church of England character of the University, because where we have college chapels, there, as a rule, the Church of England service, and that only, is to be used; and except where our students have special objections, it would seem the college authorities have full power to give them distinct religious and Church education. There has been, within my knowledge, since the year 1843, a marvellous development of religious feeling, as evidenced amongst other things by better services and more frequent celebrations of the Holy Communion. We have prayer meetings and religious associations in full operation; we have the Church Society mentioned by Mr Stanton, and we have this remarkable fact—the Theological Faculty coming together from quarter to quarter, or even oftener, to consider the subjects of theology, and see how best to bring them to bear upon the religious education of the University. Then three years ago a Mission was held under Bishop Harold Browne; we determined at first to have it only for the town and not to interfere at all with the University, but the colleges so pressed the matter that I was obliged to send to London for extra missioners to go into the colleges, with the full leave of the fellows and tutors, and hold special meetings for the undergraduates. I cannot find that on the whole our students are refusing to take holy orders on account of religious difficulties. There are other reasons for it. Our religious differences have a great deal to do with it, and I think the unsettlement of the position of the Church of England as by law established has some effect upon it, in addition to which the opening of the Civil Service and other services for our young men has had its influence. But I think the wave of indifference has passed away, and more of the able young men of the University are coming forward to take holy orders. If Mr Stanton were to speak again he might say with truth that there is a complete revolution of feeling in Trinity College, and that many of our best men there are preparing for the ministry of our Church. It seems to me that, of late, we have been forced to think more and decide more distinctly upon a religious basis as to our doings in the University—the eternal distinction between light and darkness is becoming more clearly manifested. I hope what has been told us by Mr Ince will go throughout the country from this Congress. He has come to the Congress from a sense of duty, and at much self-denial, to state his opinion that the gloomy view which the Bishop of Oxford unfortunately put forward is not based upon the fullest evi-

dence ; and he speaks as having been a resident for many years in Oxford, and thoroughly knowing the feeling of the University. My own view is, that the wave of doubt is receding from our Universities, and that there is a distinct increase of religious life founded upon thoughtful consideration of the evidences of Christianity ; and therefore I leave this subject, thanking God on the whole for the progress we are making, and not a bit fearing for the future, even though we have lost the protection we formerly had.

HOW FAR HAS RECENT LEGISLATION PRACTICALLY AFFECTED RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN OUR HIGHER SCHOOLS?

PAPERS.

The Rev. Canon Cornish.

Religious instruction, direct and indirect, as conveyed by the lesson of the schoolroom, the services of the chapel, the occasional address of the master in public, the passing word in private, by the general infusion of a Christian spirit into the secular teaching, and by other influences which might be named, which inform the minds and touch the consciences of the young—how far have these been affected (some of them in the nature of things cannot be) by recent legislation?

This is our question. And let me first say, that just thirty-five years prior to the Royal Commission of 1862, which was the first step to legislation, a great reform of our schools had been begun. Of this reform, Dr Arnold who, in 1827, had been made head master of Rugby, is regarded as the pioneer and representative. He was aided in his efforts by the increased earnestness of the age ; and other able men in other schools were fired by his example. Now it was not so much that they devoted more time to religious teaching than the grammar schools had done before ; but that they breathed their own spirit on what had frequently been the dry bones of the school instruction, and they became instinct with life. The formularies of faith and the Bible itself were perhaps not more studied than before ; but the school was made in tone and feeling more religious.

In the blue books of the Royal Commission, we may almost say that, the daily life of nine of our greatest and so-called public schools—"Votiva veluti descripta tabellâ"—stands revealed ; and what was reported of them, might also have been reported of many of our well-conducted grammar schools. And of those nine schools, I would say, that the aim of all, in the particular view of our present subject, was the same, to make religion practically influential on the minds and lives of boys. It *might be*, indeed it *was* more easily attainable in some than in others ; *e.g.*, religious instruction was more completely conveyed in those which had a chapel than in those which had not ; in boarding-schools, than in day schools, because in the former the boys were more entirely members of the same family, citizens of the same community. And yet I must here remark, that when one reads in these books, as in Merchant Tailors' School, of boys being prepared by the head master for Confirmation, and

receiving their first Communion in the chapel where he officiated, one sees what could be done even in a day school, without a chapel. Again, in others, where the boys were boarders and worshipped in the same chapel, the same use of the agencies which were available was not made by all. Sermons, *e.g.*, as a means of moulding the characters of boys, meeting their special difficulties, helping them in their special trials, were much more relied on at Harrow and Rugby, than at Eton. Different masters estimated their power differently, both on the teachers and the taught. At Eton the then head master did not care to occupy the pulpit often himself, or to see it occupied at all by the assistant masters. And, on the other hand, the head master of Harrow, who always preached once on Sunday, says in his evidence—"To the assistant masters themselves, I am convinced it is of the greatest importance to have an opportunity periodically of appealing to the consciences of the boys." I speak of this simply as illustrating the general variety of English life; for I have neither the means nor the wish to compare the character of boys, as they were affected by the schools in which they were respectively educated. We trace the same law of variety when we see that in some schools there was a good deal of work on Sunday to keep boys out of mischief; in others, almost none, that they might feel it to be a day of rest. Again, some schools had one weekly religious lesson, besides that of Sunday; some, two; some, weekly questions; and at Winchester there was a daily reading of a few verses in the Greek Testament, the effect of which was so strongly felt by Dr Moberly, that he remarks—"Our young men, especially in Oxford, are distinguished by a strongly-marked religious character."

And indeed I believe that the moral and religious condition of our public and large grammar schools in 1860 justified the combined feeling of pride and thankfulness with which thoughtful Englishmen regarded them. Boys were not better theologians, it may be, than of old; but their religious principles were stronger, their sense of duty more strict, their reverence for what was "true, pure, and of good report," greater than it once had been.

Then came our own epoch, marked, as its enemies would call it, by a spirit of restlessness and suspicion, not satisfied with things as they were, and not quite sure what it wanted; determined, as its friends would say, to demand of every institution what amount of work it was doing. First came inquiry, and then reform, or as some would say, a revolution.

Our public and grammar schools were assailed on what I may call social and intellectual grounds. The social reformer said, These schools were founded for the good of the whole nation, not for a part only. Why, then, should they be practically, if not legally, confined to members of the National Church? Why should boys be required to join in the prayers, or be taught the formularies of a Church in which they do not believe? Why should the masters of these schools be clergymen? why should its trustees be Churchmen?

Then, too, our age is an intellectual age. If some of its representative men believe in anything, they believe in knowledge. There was a pathos as well as a sarcasm in the words—"We must educate our masters;" and when it was asked, *how*, the cry of the loudest, if not of the most numerous, seemed to say—"Why, in a more complete and universal acquaintance with the three R's." This was to do it all. "These be thy gods,

O Israel!" And the feeling thus expressed in regard to the lower stratum of society was sure to be reflected in the higher. Thus the cry was, Give our boys wider and more varied information. Open new fields of study for them. Unloose the wings of your youthful Pegasus; if he cannot fly in the older domain of the classical world, bid him try his flight somewhere else.

Relax your terms of admission to our old grammar schools, was the demand of our social reformer; enlarge the subjects of their study, was the cry of our intellectual.

From the joint influence of these causes certain legislative enactments have flowed; few in number, but very important in themselves, and as evincing the spirit of the day. The law commands three things in regard to our schools. By the Act of 1869, all those which have been launched afresh with new schemes have a Conscience Clause, which exempts boys from attendance on the services of the chapel, and on the religious lessons of the schoolroom. Masters of schools need no longer be clergymen. Among the governors may be persons of all creeds. And one great result of this Act of 1869, joined to the spirit of the age which suggested it, is this: That religious knowledge more than of old is subordinated to secular. The charter of our old grammar schools always gave a great prominence to religious instruction; and naturally so, for religious zeal has ever been the great engine of education. In Tiverton school, where I was educated, we gave thanks to God in a Latin form that by the munificence of our founder we were brought up, "Studio pietatis et literarum." Pietas first, literæ afterwards. It might be a form without much meaning; but there it stood to mark the supposed intention of our founder. Now, by way of reaction, just as a straw shows which way the wind is blowing, the pious founder "is a proverb and by-word" in the talk of the day. Mr Froude says of our Transatlantic brethren, "Young Americans are all educated alike. The aim put before them is, to get on." Have we not, in theory at least, approached them?

By this Act of 1869, and by the popular feeling of which it is to some extent the index, religious teaching seems in jeopardy, and doubtless is so. There is a tide of opinion, which has led to the exaltation of mere intellect, to the neglect of other claims on the bounty of the founder. There is a tide of Liberalism which has introduced the Conscience Clause. Thus, the idea of the school as one family, with the head master in *loco parentis*, is rudely dealt with; thus, too, it happens, that boys cannot be taught so heartily and earnestly in their religious belief and their religious duties, when they no longer hold in common "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Nay, more, Dr Arnold, the most liberal of teachers in his day, felt the difficulty (as expressed in one of his letters) of having the son of an Unitarian in his class; for he could not teach him a religious or perhaps even a secular lesson, without crossing those opinions which the boy naturally honoured as those of his parents.

Again, the opening of the profession to those who are not in holy orders removes another security. A layman may be of course as religious a man as a clergyman; but his teaching is not subject to the same restraints; he loses the advantage of addressing boys from the pulpit, of preparing them for Confirmation, of administering to them their first Communion.

And next, the admission of professors of all creeds or of none among the governors of schools is ominous. However little many Englishmen may feel the influence of religion, all are inclined to talk of it, when it becomes a matter of controversy; and a discussion of this in a mixed school committee might be a sort of unbarring of the cave of Æolus to blasts issuing from every point of the theological compass.

> "Unà eumsque hotusque ruunt, creberque procellis
> Africus."

"Breakers ahead," it seems. And yet in the economy of life—especially of English life—principles are seldom pressed in practice to their logical conclusions. I know but of one place, and that does not strictly come within my subject, the Royal Military Academy of Woolwich, where (as far as my information goes) the licence of the day has its full swing; for the cadets attend or not, exactly as they please, the religious instruction provided. And considering their age, and the antecedents of many of them, who to prepare for their admission have attended the lecture-rooms of teachers in London, who do not even profess any moral supervision of their pupils, what must be the result? Set against this: at Eton there is one Roman Catholic, who attends the Windsor Chapel, and whose religious instruction is superintended by the priest; but the sons of Protestant Dissenters attend the college chapel, and the ordinary school-lessons. The pulpit is most commonly filled by the head or assistant-masters, and the boys show considerable interest in the sermons. At Winchester none are absent from the Cathedral on Sunday, from the chapel on Sunday or week-day, or from any religious lesson. At Rugby there are many boys, sons of Scotch Presbyterians and Dissenters, but none claim the protection of the conscience clause. In the large day-school at Leeds the head-master tells me, that for many years past parents might claim exemption for their boys from the teaching of the Church Catechism and the Prayer-Book. Very few avail themselves of it. Many end by becoming members of the Church of England. And he adds, "The divinity of the 6th quite keeps up to its standard, despite of divinity having dropped out of the cycle of University scholarship subjects." I was head-master of Macclesfield School for many years, and but one availed himself of the same right of exemption. Sherborne School, which has a conscience clause dating from 1721, perhaps the oldest in existence, tells a corresponding tale.

The above facts seem to show the tendency of things to continue as they have long been. They run in the groove to which they have been used. It is of course true to observe, that there has not yet been sufficient time to develop the consequences of legislation. Its results may be much more important than they have as yet been. But yet there are certain circumstances, facts of human nature and such like, which are likely still to maintain a modifying influence. I will name two, quite unlike in their own nature, but tending in their way to check the consequences which a Churchman naturally fears.

1. From the nature of the case, it is *dogmatic* teaching which legislation mainly endangers. But the teaching of the school, though I maintain that it must be based on dogma (for without it, it will be so vague and shadowy as not to deserve the name), is yet in its best form *practical*

rather than *dogmatic*. The best school sermons are of this kind, the best school lesson which desires to "leave a blessing behind it" on the souls and consciences of the taught, while it inculcates (God forbid that it should be otherwise) saving truths, will yet make their practical side more prominent than their doctrinal. While on this point, I wish to say a word about one important institution founded on a most liberal basis—the City of London School. The Act of Parliament on which that rests provides that prayers shall be read and the Scriptures, but no doctrines of the Church of England or any Protestant sect shall be taught. [I gained this from the head-master, and in a very thoughtful letter, which he kindly wrote me, he says, that under these circumstances (and I am bound to add, he does not object to them) his object is, to make the Bible *morally* and *intellectually* intelligible, and then, to use his own words, he adds, "I say morally, because I don't think the law in the Old Testament, or the life of Christ in the New, can possibly be intellectually grasped by boys, unless they master some moral conceptions about Sin, Law, Faith, Forgiveness, and such like." From this I draw two conclusions—1. That the most anti-dogmatic teaching, to be teaching at all, cannot dispense with dogma; and secondly, that an earnest man, even under the disadvantage of an indefinite creed, can do much for the moral and religious welfare of his boys.

2. The logical results of legislation may also be checked by what I will call social feeling. It is a satire on human nature, but not without its truth, that the petty tradesman of a town with many of his class, is a Dissenter often for no other reason than, as a man once quaintly said to me, "You see, sir, they can't all be churchwardens." Now suppose the shop to become a store, the tradesman a manufacturer or a merchant. He emerges from the street in which he has lived to a house in the country, and sends his son to Eton or Harrow. If his religious views, as a Nonconformist, are very decided, he will, as Roman Catholics generally do, place his son at a school which represents his own opinions; and I for one commend him for it. But ordinarily, when he sends his son to a public school, he has no wish to invoke the conscience clause for him. Nay, probably, his wish is that he shall become a Churchman. Perhaps he ends by becoming a Churchman himself. The social feeling has a double action; it took them first to the meeting, then back again to the Church.

I have spoken within the limits of my time, of the priceless value of our school reform which commenced in 1827; of the chief causes of the recent legislation in 1868; of the mischievous consequences to religious instruction which that legislation logically involves; and of the probable checks to their full development.

One cannot help feeling on such a subject as this, that there is one source of danger and anxiety, which no Act of Parliament can cause or cure, the current religious or irreligious opinions of the day, which must affect the minds of our youth. Where the depths are moved everywhere, it is vain to suppose that our schools are a haven of unbroken repose. Most of my correspondents say or imply, that the minds of the elder boys are more unsettled than they used to be by articles in reviews they read or hear of, or by the results of scientific investigation; and I should sup-

pose also, by the teaching of some of the younger masters, which does not run exactly in the old channel. For it is a fact not without its significance, that many very promising young men at Oxford, who would formerly have taken holy orders, are now found as assistant masters in our larger schools, where of course they carry their religious views with them.

But this is outside my subject. We have had a race of schoolboys issuing from our public and better grammar schools, of whom in the main, as Christian young men and gentlemen, we may well be proud. And I will conclude by so far changing the poet's words, as to convert into a prayer what he stated as a fact,

"Immortale genus maneat."

And I would add of each school, which has sent them forth into the world—

"Multosque per annos
Stet fortuna domus, et avi numerentur avorum."

The Rev. H. W. Moss, M.A., Head Master of Shrewsbury School.

My sole claim to occupy the attention of the meeting this morning is the fact that I possess some practical acquaintance with the subject. I have been under the necessity of observing closely the manner in which recent legislation has affected some at least of our higher schools, and I am glad to contribute my mite to the discussion of a most interesting and important question. My own personal experience is confined to the operation of the Public Schools Act of 1868, which deals only with a small group of schools, and it is to this Act that my remarks must be understood to refer. I have no right to speak with any authority of the working of the Endowed Schools Act. So far, however, as my knowledge extends, I believe that what I shall say will also be generally applicable to many, if not to most, of the schools which are subject to its provisions.

If I were to reply to the question before the meeting, "How far has recent legislation practically affected religious instruction in our higher schools?" according to the terms in which it is framed, my answer might be given in three words—"Hardly at all." Indeed within the narrow limits to which my inquiries have been restricted, I have not heard of a single school in which the character of its religious instruction has in practice been changed or even modified by recent legislation. If the parent of any boy objects to any lesson on religious grounds, he may now obtain exemption from it for his son, but the religious instruction for those who receive it remains just what it was. Moreover, applications for exemption are very rare.

Practically then hardly any difference is apparent, but, if I may give a slight extension to the subject before us, recent Acts have undoubtedly altered the *conditions* under which religious instruction is imparted in

some of the higher schools. In some cases the character of this instruction, instead of being rigidly prescribed as heretofore, has been left vague and indefinite. It may be worth while to consider briefly what may be the ultimate effect of this change.

As a matter of fact, the religious teaching of these schools is now based upon the principles of our Church, and some strong force must be called into action before the present system will be set aside. From what quarter are we to expect this force to make its appearance? The governing bodies of the schools to which I have referred are hardly likely to alter the religious teaching. A large proportion, probably a considerable majority, of their members will, at least for a long time to come, be Churchmen, because it is in the ranks of Churchmen that there will usually be found that combination of intellectual or social eminence and familiarity with the spirit and traditions of our higher schools, which appears to be regarded as constituting the strongest claim to serve on a governing body. And, even if by some accident a governing body happened to contain a majority of secularists, I doubt whether they could make any great change in the religious teaching of any of these schools without seriously impairing its popularity and its prosperity. The wishes of the parents and the needs of the school would, most likely, compel them before long to retrace their steps.

"But," it may be said, and not without reason, "there is something else to be taken into account besides the administration of a school. Much also depends upon its executive officers. It is the masters who actually give the religious instruction. May not they either abandon it altogether or gradually attenuate it into insignificance?" Now I am not at all inclined to make light of the power which the masters of our higher schools possess for good or for evil. This is sometimes exaggerated, because hasty critics are apt to forget how many other potent influences besides that of the schoolmaster are brought to bear upon the young. What is done at school may be undone at home. An energetic and well-intentioned master, especially in a large school, may spend his strength long and to all appearance in vain, in struggling against the massive force of an evil tradition. Then again there are masters who from want of tact, or some other inherent fault of temperament, may be said to exercise a strictly negative or *minus* influence. The more emphatically they point in one direction, with the more unmistakable decision do their pupils take the opposite. Still we all know that there have been masters of exceptional force of character, who have given not only an impulse but sometimes a marked bias to the moral and religious development of particular schools, a bias which has been clearly perceptible in a second and even in a third generation. And, if they have effected so much, it is reasonable to suppose that many less able masters may, in spite of all hindrances, succeed in impressing a permanent stamp upon the religious convictions of their pupils. Is there any danger that this momentous power will be abused?

I may say at once that for my own part I do not think that this danger is greater now than it has been in the past. The "liberty of prophesying" necessarily involves some degree of danger. One-sided views of religion, individual peculiarities of doctrine, may be inculcated with mis-

chievous reiteration. I am afraid that this fault is not absolutely unknown even in our churches: it is probable that it will from time to time show itself in our schools. But there are several reassuring considerations to be set on the other side.

In the first place, I feel no doubt that the great majority of the masters in our higher schools conscientiously believe, and therefore can conscientiously teach, that Divine revelation to which our Church bears constant witness. Too sweeping inferences, I think, are sometimes drawn from the frequency of religious doubts and difficulties among the younger members of the universities, from among whom the teaching staff of our higher schools is mainly recruited. No doubt the vague conjectures and floating theories of early manhood sometimes crystallise into solid and permanent unbelief. Still it must be within the knowledge of many here, that there are also those, and they not a few, who are led by God's providence through the chaos of conflicting philosophies and the darkness of a temporary distrust into the recognition of a divine order and the clear light of a fuller faith.

In the second place, it must not be forgotten that the teaching in our higher schools usually proceeds on certain clearly-defined lines—lines which have not been hastily adopted, and are not likely to be abandoned without much consideration. An individual master, for instance, would hardly venture to make an important change in the text-books of his form or class on his own responsibility. Then again, generally speaking, teaching must be very plain and outspoken, very pointed and precise, if it is to make its way into a boy's mind. Nature has endowed most boys with a healthy impenetrability to hints. If—and the very supposition seems most improbable—a master were to suggest unchristian doctrines which he dared not state, most of his pupils would be merely bewildered, and, if they did at last grasp his meaning, would be far more likely to resent than to welcome it. The most threatening danger to which religious instruction is exposed in our higher schools, as it seems at least to many who are engaged in the practical work of the more advanced education, is almost the opposite of this—not the wilful propagation of religious error, but lifeless and repellent methods of imparting religious truth. It is possible to substitute a string of names and dates for religion, so to teach Christianity (I say it with all reverence) as to eliminate Christ from it; it is certainly an arduous task to make the narratives of the Evangelists uninteresting, but some compilers of school-books and some teachers have gone far towards proving themselves capable even of that achievement. I have still to mention what is perhaps, after all, the strongest security against individual eccentricities of religious teaching—the rightful expectations of parents. All masters must feel that, when parents have entrusted them with their sons, on an implied understanding as to the character of the religious instruction, they are bound to respect the confidence which has been reposed in them.

I hope then and think that religious instruction in our higher schools is menaced by no serious peril from *within* in consequence of recent legislation. Is it probable that it will be assailed from *without?* That is a very wide question, on which many who are here are far more competent to express an opinion than myself. I may however say that, while it

would be the height of rashness to predict a long period of unbroken peace, I cannot imagine on what grounds an attack is likely to be made upon the existing system. The utmost consideration is guaranteed by law and is shown in practice for the conscientious scruples of individual parents. We are all aware that the great majority of the working classes are firmly opposed to the exclusion of religion from our *elementary* schools. I am sure that most of those, whose sons are educated in our higher schools, would offer, if that is possible, a still more strenuous resistance to any attempt at secularisation—the only alternative plan which is even feasible. But I am fighting with a shadow. Our Church must indeed have lost her hold upon the affections of the English people, before those sacred truths, which are her inalienable heritage, so long as she remains in any true sense a Church at all, will be excluded from the range of our higher education. And believing, as we all believe, that those truths not only appeal to the heart with an incomparable power, but also afford to the intellect, with regard to the ultimate problems of existence, the utmost satisfaction of which our finite nature is capable, I do not know any contingency which, both as a Churchman and as a teacher, I should deprecate with greater earnestness.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. Canon Barry.

When asked to speak on this subject—as my experience of the practical work of schools has ceased for some years, and as I have very little to do with endowed schools—I thought the best thing I could do was to obtain information from the fountain-head as to the facts of the case. Accordingly, I wrote to the head-masters of all the great public schools and, under the advice of Lord Lyttelton, I also wrote to the head-masters of schools fall-' ing under the Endowed Schools' Commission which were most likely to present crucial instances.

With regard to the great public schools, my experience entirely confirms that which has been advanced so well by the two readers who have preceded me. I am inclined to think that here the treatment of the subject must be something like that well-worn story of the chapter upon snakes in Iceland, which confined itself to the simple statement that there were no snakes there at all. In other words, the effect of recent legislation is nothing whatever, except, perhaps, that, in consequence of the existence of a conscience clause, masters feel themselves somewhat more free than before in teaching that which they themselves conscientiously believe, and which the rules of the school enjoin. In respect to the much-abused conscience clause generally, it is too often forgotten that its effect is not merely to secure freedom to the scholar, but also freedom to the teacher. If I had in a class a number of boys who are forced to attend my religious teaching, whether their parents conscientiously object to it or not, I might feel my hands somewhat tied by a kind of moral compulsion ; but if I know that there is not a single boy there whose parent has not had the opportunity of withdrawing him if he chooses, then it seems to me the responsibility is transferred to the parent, and my hands, instead of being tied by the conscience clause, are left rather more unfettered than before. In these higher schools I find that the conscience clause is very rarely used. Almost the only cases I have been able to discover are cases of the children of Roman Catholic parents, and I may say that this is precisely my own experience now in dealing with men. This fact that the conscience clause is very little used, indeed, is one over which we may rejoice, but not altogether without some

misgiving. If, as I believe, the conscience clause is not used because parents do not care to use it, because after all they have a considerable confidence in our Church of England teaching, then the fact is one over which we may altogether rejoice; but if it should be said that the conscience clause is not used because practically people do not dare to use it—because there are those social influences inevitably brought to bear upon them to which the reader of the first paper alluded—because a boy does not like to be exceptional in a school and a parent does not like to make him exceptional—this view of the subject plays into the hands of those who assert that a conscience clause is a nugatory protection, and who, therefore, insist upon the exclusion of religious teaching altogether from our schools. It is fair to look at this matter in the two different lights in which it may be viewed; it is wise to remember that it is a kind of double-edged weapon with which those who use it rashly may cut their fingers. But I firmly believe, both from theory and experience, that the former view is very mainly the true one—that people do not use the conscience clause because they do not wish to use it—that when their liberty is secured, and they are guarded against any abuses of the teacher's privilege, they are satisfied, and that their refusal to use it shows after all how very much common ground there really is, in spite of our religious differences, and what a large confidence is felt in the deep but wide and comprehensive teaching of our Church of England.

So much with regard to what I have found to be the case in those schools which we commonly consider our higher schools—the nine schools singled out by the first Act. Next with regard to schools that fall under the Endowed Schools Act. Here I find that more change has taken place. In most cases, indeed, the condition of these schools is the same as that of the higher schools. They are left Church of England schools with the protection of a conscience clause, and the result is precisely as in the other case. In some instances, however, I find that there is in these endowed schools what we know very well in elementary education, as a "Cowper-Temple clause;" that is to say, that no creed or formulary distinctively belonging to the Church of England is allowed to be taught; that the Bible is freely read and taught, but it and it alone is the text-book of the religious instruction. I would ask you here again to disabuse your minds of a great deal that is commonly said on this subject, and to consider what the real effect of this restriction is. I have often heard it said on both sides (for on this matter the two extreme parties are willing enough to shake hands over the body of the party which lies between them) that the effect is to pledge a school to what men call undenominational Christianity. I heard a friend, yesterday in the Congress Hall, describe religion under it as a necessarily colourless religion. I venture to doubt the accuracy of both those statements. It appears to me that all that is done by such a clause as this is that which the clause itself declares—that you cannot ticket a school and say—"This is a Roman Catholic school; this is a Church of England school." This is obvious, but beyond this what will be the effect of any such enactment? That the Bible, not merely read, but freely read and taught, shall be the text-book of religious instruction. I need not remind you that every English Churchman holds that Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, and that nothing that is not read therein or can be proved thereby is to be insisted upon as a term of salvation. If then the Bible is freely read and taught, what must be the inevitable effect? The process that will take place is that which is known as "natural selection" or the "survival of the fittest;" in other words, whatever the mass of educated Englishmen believe will be that which will emerge in the teaching of our schools. For although a teacher is bound not to attempt proselytism, I do not hold that his hands are at all tied as to the enunciation of what he thinks needful truth, in the reading of Holy Scripture in either of these classes of schools. It is of great importance to remember this, because our opponents, the secularists, are constantly perverting this restriction by saying that it imposes on us the impossible task of teaching an undenominational religion. This I emphatically deny. I ask again, What will be the effect upon these schools? I imagine that the mass of educated men very largely belong to the Church of England; and, besides this, I believe that in the ordinary kind of teaching given to boys there is an enormous

amount of common ground between the Church of England and those commonly called the orthodox bodies of Nonconformists. There might be much in common with Roman Catholics, if they would combine with anybody else, but this they never do. Hence I apprehend that so long as the Church of England is the great leader of religious opinion in this country—so long as she is the great centre of religious truth and unity in this country—even under these restrictions (which I, for one, greatly regret) there will still be a large amount of what we should consider good, true, and Church of England instruction given in this second class of schools.

I pass on to another change introduced—namely, throwing open many head-masterships to laymen. I greatly rejoice in this, for many reasons. Whilst I claim for the clergy a large and leading place in the teaching of the country, I do not see why we should keep from laymen posts which they are well qualified to fill. The change, however, removes one more safeguard for religious instruction; and to meet this, I can only say we must depend upon the general soundness of our Church itself, and therefore upon the religious tone of our highly-educated laymen. The future depends not on legislation, but on the general tone of religious opinion and faith. If it be true that the wave of infidelity of which we have heard so much has in a great degree spent its force in the universities, then the effect of the reaction against infidelity will be found in our schools, and we shall not have any great reason to fear because head-masterships are open to laymen. But of this I feel sure, that if our educated laymen cannot be trusted in the work of religious teaching, the cause of religion itself must be fatally weak—so weak that it would be impossible to be sustained by any number of privileged clerical teachers.

After all, it appears to me that the effect of recent legislation is this—it takes away from Church of England teaching a large amount of the protection of what is called law. There is evil here, but not unmixed evil; and out of evil may come good. There are men above law and men below it. For the mass of those who lie between the two I believe the help of the law to the spirit is sound; therefore I do not at all undervalue the evil that may occur from the withdrawal of the protection of what we may in the largest sense call law. But if the effect is to throw us back more upon the spirit—in other words, to make us rely less on legal enactment and more on spiritual power—that is a result which no Churchman ought to regret. As a matter of fact, there can be no doubt that the religious tone and spirit of our schools are infinitely deeper than in days when we were fenced about with more legal protections than we have now. I firmly believe that condition of things will continue. I am not afraid of passing waves and phases of infidelity. I believe we can safely rely upon the intrinsic power of the religion we profess over the minds of men, and especially men of the highest education and culture; and while this is the case, I have no fear whatever that recent legislation, even if it had been ten times more important than is actually the case, would materially affect the religious education given in our higher schools.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. Mr Anderson.

I rejoice at the hopeful feeling that has characterised all the speaking this morning, inasmuch as those who have spoken are inclined not to murmur at that which has gone away from us, but to endeavour to do our duty. I wish to make a remark with reference to what was said by the last speaker as to certain positions formerly confined to the clergy being open to the laity. That I consider to be a great advantage to the cause of religion, because every person who has been in the habit of reading the notices of infidelity spoken of, finds that the undercurrent lying under the objections is, that the clergy, by having taken certain vows, are bound to maintain the doctrines to which they

have sworn allegiance. I conceive, therefore, that if we can obtain laymen to teach these doctrines which we, the clergy, have promised to hold, they will come with greater weight upon the minds of those persons of whom we have spoken. The only thing I should deprecate is, that the clergy should not be allowed to have these positions. If they are allowed to compete with the laymen, I believe that in nearly every instance the clergy would be chosen ; and, if not, there must be some reason why the education of the clergy has fallen below the education of the laity, and there could be no stronger call than that for our improving the education of the clergy. There are many questions that can be more fairly discussed by the laity than the clergy, and I believe the prejudice existing in some minds against clerical teaching would be removed when they found that the laity appointed to these positions teach the same truths as ourselves, and hold them with the same degree of clearness. As to the connection between this subject and the subject we discussed last night, "The popular arguments of unbelief and how to meet them," the teaching in the higher schools is necessary to enable the students to avail themselves of the higher advantages of the universities, and anything that would impair the efficiency of the higher schools would injure the cause of religion itself, by effecting more decidedly that divorce between science and religion, which is to be deplored. It is necessary for us, as men who value the truths of religion, to show that we are acquainted with the truths of science ; not only that we should answer the objections given from a scientific point of view, but that we should win the men whose doubts we are endeavouring to remove. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that in our endeavours to promote the higher education of the country we do so, believing that the best-educated man will be the most sincere and honest Christian.

Mr Beresford Hope, M.P.

We are specially discussing not so much the system of upper schools in themselves as those schools as practically affected by recent legislation, and I want to call the attention of this Congress to a side of the question not yet touched upon. Those who have spoken hitherto have dealt with the schools that have been affected by recent legislation : I want to point out how large a margin of such schools there is in the country which have not been so affected. In the committee on the Endowed Schools Act, of which I was a member, nothing was affected which had been endowed less than fifty years ago. As far as the schools have fallen under that and the previous Act, whether the nine public schools or the other so-called endowed schools, I am willing to accept and heartily believe in the bright anticipations of Mr Moss and Dr Barry. I believe these schools must, even for social considerations, stick to the Church of England : as long as the Church of England is the Church of the great majority of thinking and educated men in this country, so long, even for material considerations, our public schools cannot cut the cable. But they must be kept up to the collar ; and how can they be kept up to the collar ? By the fact of the existence alongside of them of a new class of endowed and upper schools in the country which have not fallen under legislation, and which are therefore able to develop their own organisation for themselves, and which have developed that organisation for themselves, absolutely and without compromise, upon the lines of the Church of England. I refer, of course, to such institutions as the school at Radley ; and to that larger circle of schools of which we have so distinguished an instance a very few miles from here—the schools under the general name of St Nicholas College ; the schools of Denstone, near here ; of Lancing, in Sussex ; Hurstpierpoint, Ardingley ; and others of the like

kind, which come under the fifty years' clause of the Act. I was, as I have said, on the committee of the House of Commons to which that bill was referred, and somebody observed that this provision would save these schools. "Yes," said Mr Forster; "and if Canon Woodard's schools had not been saved from the operation of my bill, I would have introduced some provision to save them." These, we all know, may be schools without a conscience clause, and people may say the system is too rigid. Well, does not that open out the law of existence in a community like our own—free competition? It is in this free competition of schools, the one class of schools which has come under Parliamentary regulation, but which, in spite of or by help of Parliamentary regulation, still maintain their Church character conditioned by conscience clause or otherwise, and the other class of schools that has not come under Parliamentary regulation, but which, on the contrary, have been excepted from it, and which are therefore able to develop for themselves their own organisation unfettered—I repeat it is in this free competition that the Church can, according to the law of progress of the present day, hold her own in the great work of educating the people, not only of the upper classes, but of the middle and lower middle classes, for whose benefit schools have been organised on the "public" system hitherto applied only to the education of the richer and more luxurious portions of society, which system is accordingly found to be as applicable to the less opulent members of the community. In conclusion, I must very strongly insist that a public school without a chapel is imperfect. You cannot mould in such a case the teaching of the school on the system of the Church. In his omitting, I am sure accidentally, to touch upon this topic, Dr Barry's argument was, I think, so far imperfect. Subject to correction, I cannot now see my way to the co-existence of a chapel with definite worship and teaching and of a governing body under the Endowed Schools Act, which only recognises general Christianity. I am speaking from memory, but I believe I may call up no less an authority than Dr Arnold as expressing a strong conviction of the great moral and religious power of the school-chapel to the head-master. It is clear that the devotions which are suited to the susceptibilities of boys must be different from, must be lighter than, those adapted to an adult congregation; and it is impossible that boys can, in the long run, derive much edification from the preachings of a parochial pulpit, directed as they are to the mixed congregation of the parish. Either way, if you have a chapel in your school, continue it; if you have none, found one; but without the chapel, without the special teaching, the mere religious lecture in the schoolroom is comparatively dry. It may touch the reason, but it does not stir the affections.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, 7th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took the Chair at half-past Two.

REVIVAL MOVEMENTS, AND THE DESIRE TO WHICH THEY GIVE RISE FOR PRIVATE COUNSEL AND GUIDANCE.

PAPERS.

Rev. Richard Twigg, Rector of St James's, Wednesbury.

The importance of the subject to which the attention of the Congress is now invited can scarcely be overrated. It is one which concerns us all. It is one which deeply concerns the ministers of God's Word and Sacraments, because they have to consider it, both with reference to themselves and to the people committed to their care. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the future peace and prosperity of our Church depend to a great extent upon the action she now takes in this matter. Earnest prayer is needed that God would direct this movement (as I believe He has inspired it) to the saving of sinners, the edifying of the faithful, the good of His Church, and the advancement of His glory.

Our afternoon's discussion will be upon "Revival Movements, and the desire to which they give rise for private counsel and guidance."

I. "Revival Movements."—It is well known that they take place outside the Church, as well as within the Church. As one of the succeeding speakers will probably notice them, I shall refrain from doing so, for I know nothing of them by experience. Different opinions are held about them; but I trust that whatever view we hold we shall remember that if "some preach Christ even of envy and strife, there are some also who preach Him of good will. The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, but the other of love. What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

I shall confine my remarks to Mission work in the Church of England, especially to the work of a first Parochial Mission.

And I cannot withhold an expression of thankfulness to God that He has blest this movement, as He undoubtedly has done, notwithstanding some irregularities which may have occasionally accompanied it. It is now no longer regarded as an experiment, tried by a few enthusiastic individuals, whose zeal has outrun their discretion. Several of our bishops have not only sanctioned it, but have taken part in it. And there are persons in every part of the country who attribute to it either their con-

version to God, or their reconciliation with the Church of their fathers. Perhaps ere long it will become a recognised part of our diocesan machinery, and then there will probably be but few parishes in the country where a Mission is not held under proper authority. One proof only need now be adduced to show the success of this great movement. It is seen in the fact that for several years past the subject has been brought before our Church Congresses, and has been discussed there with ever-increasing earnestness.

(1.) Too much attention cannot be given to the preparation for a Parochial Mission. It must begin with the parish priest himself, then with his workers and earnest communicants, if it is ever to be a blessing to the careless members of his congregation, or to his ungodly parishioners. Those who are preparing for a Mission must "sanctify themselves." "When the host goeth forth against thine enemies, then keep thee from every wicked thing." Besides this there should be frequent counsel upon the matter, much private and united prayer, and the coming Mission should be made known in every way possible. While thus preparing for it, a blessing must be expected to rest upon the effort.

(2.) Much will depend, under God, upon the clergyman who conducts the Mission. He should belong to the same school of theology as the parish priest who invites him, and should take care to strengthen his hands in every way he can, taking especial care to prevent any comparison being made between the permanent ministry of the parish and the temporary ministry of the Mission. It must never be forgotten that a Mission is held, not for the purpose of putting on one side (as if inefficient) the ordinary ministry of the parish, and the accustomed means of grace therein, but loudly to call attention both to the one and to the other. It is designed from first to last to supplement the work of the parish priest, not to supplant it. "To weaken the hands of the pastor is to weaken the cause of Christ."

(3.) "It is convenient" to begin each day of the Mission with an early celebration of the Holy Communion. A short address or meditation may be given at this time with much advantage. In the forenoon a discourse upon the higher truths of the spiritual life is often delivered to the faithful. In the afternoon companies of workpeople, mothers' meetings, &c., and children (who ought never to be forgotten at these times), might be spoken to. In the evening, after due preparation by preaching in the streets, and house to house visitation, the Mission service will be held in a free and unappropriated church. The sermon should be addressed to the unconverted. Earnest appeals should be made in it to the consciences of the hearers, not merely to their feelings; and the instant and unconditional surrender of the soul to God must be insisted upon. Whatever may be the nature of the After-meeting—whether it be for instruction, prayer, or conversation—the leading idea of the sermon should be kept in view. Sermon, address, instruction, hymns, prayer, conversation, all should press upon the conscience of the sinner the same divine truth. It need scarcely be said that it is best to avoid all controversial subjects during a Mission, both at church and at home. It seems right to have a solemn service at the close of it for self-dedication and thanksgiving.

(4.) A Mission generally leaves behind it much work for the parish priest. Some parishioners have to be visited and encouraged; others

prayed with and instructed ; others prepared for full communion with the Church ; to others work has to be given ; and all have to arrange that the good work which has begun may be carried on. This is the best memorial of a Mission. In large parishes the revival movement should never cease. The evangelizing effort, to be successful, must be sustained. In this way will the parish priest learn to "do the work of an evangelist," and will soon be able to pay to other parishes the debt which he has contracted in his own.

II. Mission work, when blest by God, generally gives rise to inquiry, and to a desire for counsel and guidance. I say *generally*, but it is not always so. There are some souls impressed by Mission services who go at once to God in private prayer, and will not go from Him, nor let Him go from them, until He blesses them. The following story, told by one of the speakers at a former Church Congress, illustrates what I mean. He said, "Some years ago it was my duty to take part in a Mission at a village in Herefordshire. After one of the sermons the preacher invited those who felt concerned about the state of their souls to meet him in the adjoining school-room. It was soon quite filled. I was directed to go and speak to different persons while prayer was being made. I came at last to a young man, who was deeply moved. I knelt beside him and spoke to him. He asked me to go and see him on the following day. I did so, and put to him the same searching question I had done on the previous evening. He said, 'I think I can answer your question satisfactorily. I once listened to a sermon preached by Bishop Wilberforce in the chapel at Cuddesden College. I shall never forget it. I was arrested and awakened by it. I did as the preacher told me to do. I went, after the service was over, into my own chamber, and did not leave it until I believed I had made my peace with God.'"

Generally speaking, however, earnest Mission services create a spirit of inquiry. The question is again asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" And it is in answering wisely the different questions that may then be put to him that the skill of the missioner is chiefly seen. An inquirer comes to him ; he has listened to the powerful preaching of the Word ; he believes it ; has been moved by it ; is convicted by it. He sees his danger, but knows not clearly how to escape it. He is unable to apply to himself the promises of God, for sin has paralysed the powers of his soul, and made him unable to "lay hold on eternal life." His question, whatever his words may be, is, "What shall I do to be saved?" Now in this crisis of his soul's history he may be directed in one or other of four ways.

(*a.*) In the first place, he may be told to go and wrestle with God in private prayer until the burden of sin is removed. He does so. His chamber becomes to him what the banks of Jabbok were to Jacob. There "he weeps and makes supplication ;" and, like the sorrowful patriarch, he not unfrequently continues in prayer through the weary watches of the night—

> "With Thee all night I mean to stay,
> And wrestle till the break of day.
> Wrestling, I will not let Thee go,
> Till I Thy Name and Nature know"—

but at last, like Jacob, he "prevails." The darkness is past, and the true

light shineth. "The Sun of Righteousness arises with healing in His wings." He finds the God of Bethel, and goes on his way rejoicing. "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." May we not hope that this is the way in which numbers of our devout church-people have found the Lord? They have been walking for years in "all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." They are ready to help their clergymen in all good works. They think little (perhaps too little) of their feelings. They are more anxious to *be* right than to feel right. But if they were asked to say how and where they first sought and found the Lord, would they not reply that they were drawn to Him by the secret influences of the Holy Ghost, and that they sought and found Him, either in their own chambers, or in the courts of the house of the Lord. I believe I have given in these few words the faintest outline of the spiritual history of many who are fallen asleep in Jesus.

(*b.*) Again. Through God's mercy many souls are now able to date the beginning of their religious life to that most important period—a confirmation season—one of the revival times in a well-worked parish. Both old and young are prepared for the sacred rite, and at last are invited by the pastor to see him privately, not merely that he may see how much, or how little, of his instruction they have retained, but that he may pray for them, and with them, and teach them to exercise (as they promised in Holy Baptism to do) their latent gifts of repentance and faith. Like others who have been moved by his appeals, they timidly accept his invitation. He does what he can with them; he takes them by the hand, and leads them to Jesus, and ere long, like the young daughter of Jairus, they are gently raised by Him to newness of life. It is thus with some awakened souls at a Mission. They come and see a spiritual friend. They are met upon their own ground; every question is answered; every difficulty is removed. The invitation, "Let us pray," is soon given, and gladly, though silently, accepted. The penitent kneels down, and in broken language, prays; and this is the burden of his prayer, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son." It is not long before his head falls upon a Heavenly Father's bosom, before he feels a Father's arms around him, and a Father's kiss upon his lips.

(*c.*) There is a third way. There can be no greater help to a parish priest, nor greater blessing to his parish, than a body of devoted laymen, who exercise their different gifts under his direction. According to his advice they sing in church as choristers, read the Lessons, hold cottage lectures, read to and pray for the sick, seek out the unbaptized, teach in the Sunday-school, or commence Mission stations. Under him also they meet from time to time for mutual prayer, intercession, and "giving of thanks." I am quite aware that what are commonly called *Prayer-meetings* are somewhat unpopular; perhaps more so than they deserve to be. But I do not wonder at it, for so many things are necessary to carry them on efficiently. But when they are thus carried on, they are helpful to many, and of much use in certain parishes during a Parochial Mission. It is a matter of experience that an awakened sinner will sometimes go of his own accord into a Prayer-meeting who cannot be persuaded to go either into his own chamber or into his pastor's study to seek the Lord. With hesitating step he enters the room where prayer is wont to be made,

and quietly takes his place. The solemn hymns, the unstudied prayers, the earnestness of those who are present, and the whispered words of the missioner while kneeling at his side, deeply move him, and at last "break every barrier down." The sinner is humbled. The heart is broken and contrite; the cry for mercy is humbly made; the gift of faith is bestowed and used; divine love is infused into the soul; praise trembles upon the lips, and at last the believing soul gratefully exclaims—

> "Oh! that the world would taste and see
> The riches of His grace;
> The arms of love that compass me
> Would all mankind embrace."

(*d.*) I believe the fourth way is referred to in the Prayer-book. The Church teaches us that when a penitent sinner opens his grief to some discreet and learned minister of God's Word, he will receive, through him, the benefit of absolution. "Our Lord Christ has left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him." The testimony of departed saints, the writings of our own divines, the experience of many in our own time (and the number is daily increasing) are clear upon this point. There is still power in the ministry of reconciliation. It is a matter of no doubt with some—it is a blessed reality. And so awakened souls at a Mission, "who cannot quieten their own consciences," at last resolve to use this means of grace; they "open their grief," and they "receive the benefit of absolution." The following lines of Faber describe the happy experience of more than one soul:—

> "I cried out for mercy, and fell on my knees,
> And confessed, while my heart with keen sorrow was wrung;
> 'Twas the labour of minutes, yet years of disease
> Fell as fast from my soul as the words from my tongue.
>
> "And now, blest be God, and the sweet Lord who died,
> No deer on the mountain, no bird in the sky,
> No bright wave that leaps on the dark bounding tide,
> Is a creature so free, or so happy as I.
>
> "All hail, then, all hail, to the dear precious blood,
> That hath worked these sweet wonders of mercy in me;
> May each day countless numbers throng down to its flood,
> And God have His glory, and sinners go free."

Which of these four ways is the best? I suppose each of us would call that the best way through which he had himself found peace with God. I suppose a clergyman would say that was the best way through which most penitents were brought to the feet of Christ. But, surely, both past history and present experience teach us that the Holy Ghost has used and still uses all these means. Let us be thankful that this is the case, and careful not to disparage one of them. One cannot lay down any rule upon the subject, but, perhaps, under God, one of the surest ways of forming a noble, faithful soul, is to direct it first of all, in order to quieten the conscience, to wrestle with God alone until the burden of sin is removed; then to lead it to "make confession with the mouth of the Lord

Jesus," until freedom of utterance and holy liberty be obtained; and lastly, when, in course of time, it yearns for complete deliverance from the inbred sin with which it is tied and bound, to permit it to open its grief to some minister of God's Word, who is neither young, nor unlearned, nor indiscreet.

But one word more, and I have done. In most of our parishes Mission work is a necessity. Our present parochial system (admirable in itself) has done all that it can do. The overworked, and too often underpaid, parish priest is struggling against difficulties of all kinds, and yet there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of souls beyond his reach. What, then, is to be done? Let a Mission be held; encourage him; hold up the hands which hang down. Let the Bishop send clergymen and laymen to preach in the church, and schools, and streets, and houses; and let it be known that he sends them. Let us thus attempt to "compel" sinners to come in to the gospel feast. Missions will not do everything, but they will do a great deal. They will show us that spiritual death is amongst us—that spiritual life can only be given by the Holy Ghost—that He still speaks by the prophets—that He still works through the Word and Sacraments.

Thank God for what the Church has been able to do during the last few years! But much remains for her to do. She has battles still to fight. She has victories still to win. But "to be more than conqueror," all that she needs is to be faithful to herself and to her God.

If the Church were to arise in all her strength; if she were to shake herself from the dust which still clings to her raiment; if she were to cease to trust in an arm of flesh; if she were to go forth in the strength of the Lord God, she would "move the land." Sinners would be converted, and live. Her sons and daughters would come to her from far; the faithful would go on to perfection; those whom she has alienated by coldness and neglect would return to her, and say, "Receive us into thy bosom," and once more she would become the "joyful mother of children."

One's heart is full while we think and speak of her, and "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth will speak." May God still bless the dear old Church of England! May God choose her as the instrument through which He will dispense spiritual light and life to our countrymen! May she be the centre around which shall reunite the different communions in our land! These blessed days may come. Some of our children may live to see them. And should they ever gladden their eyes I will venture to foretell what there will be. There will be a spiritual and united Church—a self-denying, Christ-like clergy, obeying with cheerfulness the godly admonitions of spiritual fathers, who teach more by holy example, than by precept—a loving, generous, and devoted laity. There will be glorious victories over the world, the flesh, and the devil. Christ's kingdom will be extended, and His glory shine throughout the world.

Mr W. T. Paton.

There is one aspect of this question which at the outset we shall do well to keep prominently in view. It is this—That the subject has a personal as well as a relative application, and that the most practical way to help forward a revival is to seek to be revived ourselves. To expect a revival without having, in the first place, become conscious of renewed spiritual life and experiences ourselves, is to overlook the primary condition through which the blessing is to come. Not only must it have its initiative in the Church, but with the individual members of the Church, if it is to find its way influentially into the world, for the process of divine truth is from the personal to the relative. And this principle, though as old as the Psalms, is just what we need in a renewed application to the present day. Let but the prayer of faith go forth from every heart: God be merciful unto *us*, and bless *us*, and cause His face to shine upon *us*—and the response will assuredly be seen in "His way becoming known on earth, and His saving health among all nations." "How can I promote a revival amongst my people?" was the anxious inquiry made by a clergyman of his friend. "Brother, revive thyself," was the suggestive and practical reply.

We speak of "*getting up*" a revival: I should as soon speak of "*getting up*" a harvest. My own experience, so far as it goes, tells me that any spasmodic effort in relation to this work ends more or less in failure. The laws of the spiritual kingdom are more uniform than we may be disposed to think, and its influences are not extended by mere fits and starts, or by a "lo! here, or a lo! there;" but on the steady and fixed lines of effort and prayer. The revival movements with which I have been connected, and which have resulted in permanent good, have been, humanly speaking, the outcome of thoroughly organised effort and plan. Long before the special services began, individual members of the church were requested to make them the subjects of prayer both in their private devotions and at the family altar; churches gathered together in united supplication; Sunday-school teachers and church workers made them the subject of special devotional meetings; they were alluded to from the pulpit; house to house visitation was set on foot; committees were appointed to give effect to purposes and plans; the press was invited to notice the movement; and even the medium of a public advertisement was not ignored. The result of all this organisation was natural; curiosity was aroused, and expectation excited—two important factors in the work—and by the time the services were announced for the people, the people were prepared for the services. And with the services came the blessing. It would be strange indeed had it been otherwise. Bringing our efforts to the altar of consecrated service, and supplementing these efforts by earnest prayer, we relied on the fulfilment of a promise which never failed us: "Prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

And the success of revival movements is not in any way to be disconnected from the more regular means of grace. It is true revival movements must be regarded as a *special effort*, but the benefits which

accrue are not reaped at the *expense* of the ordinary methods of church effort, but as the *result* of them. As far as my observation goes, it is *not* the utterly ignorant and uninstructed who are generally influenced and benefitted; on the contrary, those whom I frequently met in the Inquiry-room had been at one time or other church-goers: others had been brought up in our Sunday-schools; many were the children of pious parents; nearly all were more or less acquainted with the claims of the gospel; so that they were where they were, owing, no doubt, to the special effort made in the revival service but apart from influences which had already been at work, the probability is, they would not have been touched by the revival movement at all. And this leads me to say, that we should have recourse to revival movements, not so much because ordinary methods have failed, but rather through the faithful discharge of ordinary church methods, work towards, and prepare for, a still larger blessing in the special service. Thus the revival will not be anything unusual or abnormal, but the natural and periodical outcome of earnest everyday effort. Revival movements should be the *result of*, not the *substitute for*, spiritual life and activity; the harvest gatherings of a devoted ministry—a working church, and an able, efficient, and faithful preaching of the gospel.

I have a conviction that the minds of the public will more or less respond to direct earnest Christian effort. I have heard of a "widespread infidelity." I believe in the infidelity, but I do not believe it is so "widespread." For one man who says, "I do not believe in religion," there are thousands who never give it a thought. We have to contend not so much against antagonism as against indifference; but indifference is just the evil that a revival movement ought to disperse. Nevertheless, with all our infidelity and with all our indifference there are multitudes who are anxious and restless for a something which only the gospel can supply; and if we could but bring *them* within the influences of an aggressive effort they would eventually be won for Christ.

I confess—and I do so with profound sorrow—that evangelistic effort has not reached with effective results the masses of our people: perhaps one reason for this may be that its influence on the higher and middle classes has not been so very apparent as to give it a strong commendation; and another reason about which there is no *perhaps* is, that the public-house beats the Church, and keeps possession of the field. Yet I object to revival movements which are projected for the purpose of benefitting a class, "working" or not working. Human nature has the same need everywhere. Indeed, if privilege and responsibility count for anything, our anxieties should be not so much on account of the masses as on behalf of the more educated: for, if the "many stripes" are to fall on those who know most and "do least," our efforts should be directed, not only towards the most ignorant, but also towards the most guilty. The truth is, the revival net should be a *draw-net*: it should sweep in all classes; for it is as the gospel reaches the wealthy, it will permeate down to the poor, and in reaching the poor it will work upwards towards the wealthy.

"But is there not a great deal of excitement at these revivals, and is there no fear lest evil should result?" I would answer in the words of the old captain who, in reply to the inquiry of a passenger unaccustomed to a stiff gale and a rolling sea—"Captain, is there any fear?" said, "*Oh*,

plenty of fear, but no danger." Speaking within the circle of my *own experience*, and it is not a limited one, I can only say I never knew of a solitary individual who received harm through over-excitement at any revival service with which I have been connected; but I have known of numbers who have received incalculable blessing. Do not let us be afraid where no fear is. We are in danger not from too much excitement, but from too little enthusiasm, and the one is only too often condemned under the name of the other. Undue and unnatural excitement I deprecate as strongly as any one, but let us be careful to distinguish between things which differ. And whilst we guard against excitement, let us at the same time not extinguish the enthusiasm; for when the Church loses that power she will be shorn of half her strength and almost all her usefulness.

But is not the element of fear unduly appealed to in the addresses? In my experience this has not been the case. This power which has reached the hearts of the people has been the simple preaching of the gospel—the love of God to the sinner, in the gift of His Son, and in the person and work of Jesus Christ. But were it otherwise, we have the highest authority for a judicious and faithful use of this element in our addresses and appeals. Some, we are told, are to be *saved* with fear, for it is a question whether they can be reached in any other way. Fright *is* to be condemned. Merely to frighten is but to confuse and paralyse; but the influence of fear is an instrument which has been used by the holiest hands, and is not to be either universally condemned or ignored.

Are the results lasting?—The answer to this question depends on the answer to another—Has the Revival work been followed by *Pastoral work?* "We do well to promote the *Revival:* but we should be equally anxious as to the *Survival.*" The revival will be more or less aggressive—the work of the Church will be to follow immediately in its train, and by folding the converts, directing the inquirers, counselling the anxious, comforting the weak-hearted, and above all, enlisting the sympathy of young life by giving young converts *something to do*—retain that which she acquired; for it is in both efforts that permanent results will ensue.

Let me add that—Four results have certainly accrued from the revival movements with which I have been connected:—

1. Sinners have been converted. I have known myself of drunkards reclaimed, and of the profane becoming reverent and devout. Parents have given thanks for the conversion of their children; and children have rejoiced in the conversion of their parents. Prodigals have returned home, and mothers have received their dead raised to life again. I have known of those who came to mock remain to pray, and those who have been most prejudiced become the most devoted. And our simple reply to any who may honestly doubt the genuineness of the work, is this—We have seen and heard in all its spiritual significance, the lame walk, the lepers cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead raised, and the gospel preached to the poor, and many made partakers of the blessedness of those who are not offended in Jesus Christ.

2. Churches have been quickened, and the number of communicants considerably augmented.

3. Christian workers have been encouraged and blessed. It was no uncommon thing to see men, on whose time the secular duties of life made the severest demands, engaged night after night in the work, who

afterwards testified that so great was their joy in seeing faces brighten with all the hopes of the gospel, and in seeing young converts realising all the blessedness of a present and full salvation, that they never knew what it was to feel even wearied *in* the work much less *of* it: and to whom the recollection is to this day an inspiration and a power. True—there may have been things said—there may have been things done—to which exceptions might be made—but I am speaking the testimony of hundreds of Christian men, when I say they were as the small dust of the balance compared with the good which was accomplished.

A distinctive feature of the revival movements with which I have been connected was the Inquiry-room. It has this advantage: it enables us to come at once into direct contact with the spiritually anxious, and that without even a seeming intrusion—for people come to the Inquiry-room only in response to an invitation which they are quite at liberty to refuse; and upon the distinct understanding that, if they do come, they come to converse about spiritual matters; so that no privacy is invaded upon an understanding so clear.

The desire for spiritual counsel and direction is more wide-spread than one would, in the first instance, suppose. I believe there are numbers of people not only inside our churches, but many also who, at one time, were to be found inside, but, alas, are now found outside—who making no marked and distinct profession of religion, are yet by no means indifferent to its claims—of whom it may be said that inasmuch "as they are not *against* the gospel"—they are to that extent *for* it—and who are waiting—anxiously waiting, for the kindly help and sympathy of some Christian worker to lead them to Christ. They have been impressed, more or less, under the ordinary means of grace, but have attached themselves to no church. But they find their way into the Inquiry-room. And the reason for this is not far to seek. So long as the gospel is faithfully preached, and, I may add, practised, so long will people be influenced by it, and, as a consequence, there will be religious anxiety; it is, to my mind, a necessity of our spiritual nature; and whilst men are endued with a conscience or inspired by a holy impulse, so long will there be anxious souls. Revival movements, no doubt, augment and intensify the anxiety: and, to a large extent, are creative of it: but it does, as indeed it ought, exist as the result, at one time or other, of faithful gospel teaching. I have met in the Inquiry-room those who had never even heard the preacher, and, consequently, could not have been impressed by the special address; I have conversed with sceptics, who were there because hitherto for years they had been groping in darkness, and in their way seeking for the light; I have spoken with backsliders who still cherished a lingering hope that *He* who had such a gracious way of receiving those whom every one rejected, would even yet in nowise cast them out; and I believe they were there just because there was such a place as the *Inquiry-room*; this was, as it were, the net which drew them to land; and the probability is that, had the congregation dispersed in the usual way, they would never have sought an interview with either a clergyman or minister.

It is of the utmost importance that the conduct of the Inquiry-room should be in the hands of judicious and responsible workers. On so

important a subject I desire to speak with becoming gravity. Let me say, then, that one paramount qualification of a worker should be this: That he should know in his own experience what it is to have the heart broken under a sense of sin, and bound up again by the gracious assurance, "Thy sins, which are many, are all forgiven thee." For let us never forget that we cannot effectually invite to a higher experience than that which we have ourselves reached. Any one who presumes to enter upon the solemn duties of the Inquiry-room without a deep sense of responsibility, or who undertakes those duties, without realising that it is only as he has himself been in living fellowship and communion with God that he is in any way competent to speak to an anxious soul, presumes to enter where the best of men will fear to tread.

But does not the Inquiry-room come "perilously near" the confessional? Not if I understand the confessional. If by the confessional is meant that inquirers are encouraged in any way to confess particular sins; and if they are further encouraged to do so by the assurance that they may or can be absolved by any power or authority on earth; my answer is clear and emphatic. No such practice has ever obtained in any Inquiry-room with which I have had to do. It is not a man's particular *sins* that are the subject of conversation: the man is spoken with because he feels himself a *sinner*. It is *sin*: not *sins*: not the thing in detail, but the thing in principle, that is dealt with: and the only relationship in which the worker, be he layman or clergyman, stands to the inquirer, is that of friend and counsellor, whose place is to stand as far in the background as possible, so that he may point all the more clearly to the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world. And as to any absolution short of that which the Great High Priest Himself pronounces in His Word and testifies to by His Spirit—not only would it, in my judgment, be out of place, but it would avail nothing: for the conscience-stricken sinner there is but one refuge, and that is in being led personally and directly to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Rev. J. Oakley, M.A., Vicar of St Saviour's, Hoxton, N.

My starting point is that a revival movement or Mission is no breach of the order of the Church's life; but merely a quickening of her pulses in healthy, albeit exceptional, exertion. It is a gathering up of all her normal forces and powers for a special effort. Habit is the great snare of religion. Reaction is the corrective of habit. Revivals represent reaction against the force of habit.

Without saying, then, that nothing should be done in Missions or revivals that is not done at other times (which is obviously absurd), it may be said that nothing has any place there which does not find its authority and counterpart in the ordinary means of grace; that nothing can be right then which is wrong at other times; that nothing can be generally used then which has not some use and place, however different the conditions, in the regular and necessary life-work of the Church.

My thesis is, that whatever personal guidance and counsel is needed in Missions—although then to a greater extent, and on a larger scale—is

always, to some extent, necessary for "the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ;" for there are always either converts to confirm, or sick to tend, or wounded to bind up, or sheep or lambs to feed; and further, that the exercise of this personal ministry of guidance and counsel which has been found so indispensable and so beneficial in our Missions—which arises out of them, but does not cease with them—requires to be recognised, provided for, methodised, regulated, far more than it is in our ordinary ministry.

It is not only foreign to the object and plan of this Congress, but it is also unnecessary—to broach any discussion of the doctrine of the Christian priesthood here. In a Congress of Churchmen, it would be almost impertinent to bring Church doctrine into question. Were this the time or place, I could be very well content to rest the theological case for some authoritative reconciliation or ministerial absolution, which is, of course, a main motive of the "demand for personal guidance and counsel"—on Hooker's arguments, as a whole, in the first part of his sixth book, complicated as they are with the controversies of his time. And they are at least anti-Roman enough. Yet I should not at all despair, if need were, of bringing his reasonings and conclusions, by mutual explanation, into practical agreement even with the Canon of the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV., c. 4) on the same subject. And if more modern and popular expositors should be asked for, I would venture to refer any one to the fifth chapter of Mr Sadler's admirable little treatise, *Church Doctrine—Bible Truth.* But on none of this must we enter now. As it is, it may be sufficient to declare, in all frankness and simplicity, that nothing is about to be contended for but what has been contended for and acted upon, in some degree, by the whole long line of the great Anglican divines, whose names alone are too numerous to cite without invidiousness, and without weakening the invincible strength of the chain by resting on a few links only; nothing is to be advocated but what is illustrated by the words or the lives not only of Bishop Ken, Bishop Wilson, George Herbert, John Keble, but also of Richard Baxter, John Wesley, Richard Cecil, Charles Simeon; nothing, in fact, need be claimed but what has been admitted or maintained over and over again, by nearly every Bishop and Archbishop of any note in the Church of England for above three hundred years, from Archbishop Cranmer to Archbishop Tait!

Let us turn to the principle involved. To all preachers of the gospel, commissioned or uncommissioned, the professed object is the same, and the same as St Paul's—"We beseech you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." To all of us ordained priests the commission which we have received has some meaning. For, however exercised or interpreted, all real ministry of Christ "binds or looses." "To one it is the savour of life unto life: to another, the savour of death unto death." "On either side one, and Jesus in the midst."

1. First, then, there is surely such a thing as absolving preaching of the Word of God. Let us never deny it, or doubt it. "The Word of God is not bound." Itself "discerns the thoughts and intents of many hearts." Itself "binds up" many a wounded soul, "pouring in oil and wine." Were we really (which I don't believe any one does) to tie all pardoning and reconciling grace to ministerial absolution of the individual penitent after detailed confession (against which Hooker so ably and con-

vincingly argues, refuting it easily out of the admissions of its supposed advocates), we should surely need to blot out not a few pages of the Bible, if not to put in a few new ones.

But is the alternative really between this and confining the minister of Christ wholly to his pulpit ministrations? Must we deny all place to private dealing with souls, reject all manner of confession, and explain away all meaning and virtue from the ministerial message—"Thy sins be forgiven thee, go in peace"? Most assuredly not. And it seems a natural and necessary sequel of the previous papers to claim, without further argument, and upon practical grounds only, full liberty for that to which Missions inevitably give rise, and of which they have taught us the value—viz., the freest intercourse between the Christian minister and his flock, with a view to the confirmation of their faith, the perfecting of their repentance, the comfort of their souls, or the deepening of their piety.

It is certainly not my aim to bid for popularity; but I fear I must begin with a popular remark. This paper will not advocate anything like the universal requirement or enforcement of confession in any form. That, at least, is surely not at all the broad general result of the experience which has been hitherto gained in Missions. If I were at liberty to quote some answers very kindly returned to me, in confidence, by some friends whom I ventured to question before preparing this paper, I could, I believe, convince you how universally the idea of obliging people to go to confession is disclaimed, even by those popularly credited with doing so. The fact is, that a confession in any form requires two free agents, neither of whom can compel the other. I do not overlook moral pressure and indirect compulsion. I believe it to be of rare occurrence, and, where the tendency may exist, to be distinctly on the decrease amongst us.

I content myself with asking whether any one seriously expects, or even desires, to see Church of England Missions, or parishes generally, "worked" through the agency of "confessionals" in every parish church, and with indicating the objections which seem to me to be conclusive against such an idea, either in theory or in practice—(*a*) the tendency to undue and needless formality; (*b*) the unmistakable warning of modern continental Christianity; (*c*) the deep and not unreasonable prejudice against this method of Church discipline in England; (*d*) the practical inconvenience, as compared with simpler and less formal measures (on this point I could say very much); (*e*) the risk of defeating the very object of the plan (which is undoubtedly the quickening of piety), by the certain temptation to superficial and superfluous confessions; (*f*) the disproportion, so to speak, between the only *formula* of private absolution suggested to us, and what may be spoken of as the minor transgressions which are apt to be the burden of frequent confessions with a corresponding weakening and vulgarisation of that great remedy; (*g*) the inability of the humbler and less educated classes to express themselves at all adequately on deep topics or personal experience; the absence, in a word, of any practicable bridge whatever into the real mind of the very classes who most need spiritual help and training in some form; and the consequent risk that confession will tend to become, as it has become elsewhere, a perfunctory, a deadening and chilling, instead of a quickening and reviving exercise. I lay no stress on the alleged moral risks to either party; for I do not believe in them, at all events in the popular sense. But I am contending for the

maintenance as far as possible of the pastoral idea, alongside of, though of course not to the exclusion of, the priestly idea, in all such interviews and communications. That there must be some form and system, some official surroundings, some atmosphere of authority, I would contend as strongly as any. But of this presently.

I hope earnestly that what I have here said will not be construed by any sensitive or censorious ear as a censure—which would indeed be presumptuous—on any of the brethren who may have carried their practice further than my arguments have seemed to go. I am humbly contributing to an important discussion the conclusions to which I have been honestly led. God forbid that such a one as I should by one word "make the heart of the righteous sad, whom God hath not made sad." Yet it may, I hope, be allowable to offer some reasons for moderation and prudence. I can only say that if there has been exaggeration or error of judgment in this matter, it is not upon the clergy who may have been led into it that I for one should lay the load of blame. They have erred, if at all, out of love and zeal for the souls for whom Christ died. We were turned out into our parishes—most of us without much training or even counsel; and we have not the benefit of much authorised pastoral theology to guide us. At any rate, if any man may share the hope of them that turn many to righteousness, he can afford to estimate at its true value all human praise or blame.

2. But, I ask, is all preaching absolving preaching? Does none even bind more than it looses? Can we all of us make that Word which is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," available for all its ends in two or three discourses a week, out of our pulpits?

Why does the Church of England alone profess or attempt to do so? English Dissenters know better. Every conceivable device to keep alive personal religion and to give the pastor some knowledge of his flock is known to them, culminating perhaps in John Wesley's impossible regulations (as I must hold them to be) for public confession, in those class-meetings which have done so much to foster unreality in the religion of the lower middle-class. Lutheranism has its confessional of a kind. Goethe's one complaint against it seems to have been that it was not strict enough in his case, and that the chance it gave of holding him to Christian influences was thereby thrown away. Such a notice as this, too, is common in Nonconformist congregations—"Persons desiring Christian fellowship," which means, to be admitted to the Lord's table, "will find the pastor of this church in the vestry," at stated times in the following week. Why are not such invitations commoner with us? I have heard of an excellent Congregationalist minister, much resorted to for guidance and counsel, who called upon his deacons to place a glass door to his vestry, that all secresy might be taken away from the interviews which so constantly take place there. And I suppose most persons would prefer this systematic publicity to the risk attending those vague relations of which a recent foreign instance has pained equally devout Dissenters and generous Churchmen. Whereas we still too often leave our flocks to climb tortuous staircases, or penetrate behind organs, or face a crowd of choirmen and boys, or find out the pastor in his own house, amongst his family, if they would ask his

aid in applying to themselves his public teaching, or if they really wish to open some grief which is consuming their very souls.

3. It ought not, however, to be taken as a note of great sin only, nor, on the other hand, as an exceptionally pious, nor yet as a rather weak-minded thing to do, thus to have recourse to a clergyman for counsel, even if habitually. Some clergymen can speak of the proportion of men to women who thus seek their ministry as two, three, or even four to one, though the proportion, whether in Missions or parishes, is generally much the same as the proportion of the sexes in the congregation. And to obviate this unjust interpretation of it, some kind of system in the matter is clearly required.

In a Mission it is well to announce plainly at once that it is hoped that some, if not many, will consult the missioner about their souls' health, though I am far from thinking this the sole criterion of success. A few plain words from him will easily make it understood that speaking to a priest about religion does not necessarily mean making a confession to him. If he says that those who seem to him to need the discipline of confession will be advised to use it, and that others will not, and that none who do not desire it will be urged to do so, he will probably not regret his frankness. Courage, in this case as in most others, is always the truest prudence and the best policy; and there can be little doubt that, as in Messrs Moody and Sankey's Mission, fixed arrangements for private interviews should be made from the first day of the Mission.

As to system in this matter in our parishes, it will probably be enough to remind any thoughtful parish priest of the loss of time, strength, patience, which is often involved in the total absence of any system of discipline amongst us. We have to lay, as it were, a separate spiritual siege to each individual soul. Our plan is laid, *de novo*, in each case. No recognised custom of seeking spiritual guidance and counsel at fixed times, or at any time, supplies the opportunity we desire. Lent finds us full of zeal and hope for the recovery of this or that straying sheep, and leaves us often, alas! weary and sick at heart because they have still evaded the shepherd's crook. Confirmation—the Church's personal "mission" to every individual soul, itself, in a sense, the Sacrament of Conversion—affords, of course, the obvious occasion of teaching and learning the value of personal guidance and counsel. Confirmation has surely failed of one of its great objects if the confirmed remain after it wholly unknown to the pastor, or if he remain an object of apprehension instead of confidence to them. The confirmed should never again be afraid to have recourse to their parish priest in any spiritual emergency, and should be taught and encouraged to do so. Communicant classes again—monthly at all events, weekly in large populations—do much to keep alive spiritual vitality, and to promote confidence between pastor and people, if only by giving occasion for those touches of nature and reality, in prayer or exposition, which set sermons do not so often afford, and by supplying the needed opportunity of asking a plain question, or asking for an interview at a subsequent time. Classes of direct preparation for Holy Communion again, at special seasons, have also been found most beneficial. Sixty or seventy persons have been known to meet for an hour twice in Holy Week and go through a careful self-examination, under the leadership of a clergyman, the Commandments being recited aloud, and silence kept for secret confession and prayer, the

whole ending with the Confession and Absolution in the Communion-Service. After which any who cannot really quiet their own conscience herein will be much more likely to come personally to their pastor and open their grief. Prayer-meetings, too, however conducted, especially among the humbler classes, or where Wesleyanism has been beforehand, and has left its peculiar mark upon a place, will be found most useful to promote such pastoral intercourse, confidence, and knowledge.

But in any well-worked parish some definite system of attendance for personal guidance and counsel is most desirable. If a parish priest make it known that he is in the church or vestry or parish-room, or other well-known and accessible place, at stated hours on stated days, at least weekly, and oftener in Lent and Advent, and before great festivals—the church being very preferable, unless the room be, as it sometimes is, part rather of the church than of the house—he can make it plain enough, as in a Mission, that going thus to the clergyman does not always mean "going to confession," but that he is glad to speak to and advise any on any really "spiritual" business, from advice about a book, or work, or plans of life, up to confession itself if need be. If this be done by a truly "discreet and learned minister," I cannot doubt that in the quaint phrase of the author of "The Old and New Learning"—"The people shall come to the priest by heaps and swarms" (*Thos. Turner*). But, it will be said, there is some risk of religious gossip. It need never occur twice. One who showed that tendency could be easily suppressed. There is less risk of it, of course, in a church than in a house. Wherever it be, it is easy, when a time has been publicly set apart, and others, perhaps, are waiting, to dismiss an unprofitable visitor, of whom, in ordinary circumstances, it might not be easy with courtesy to get rid.

4. But a very important question comes into view here—that of the restrictions (if any), perhaps only on the basis of age, to be laid upon the clergy to whom recourse may thus be had for personal guidance and counsel. One thing is pretty clear. The unmarried curate in lodgings should, as a general rule, not hold such interviews on religious business in his rooms with any one. Should he as a rule hold such interviews at all? It is difficult for some of us, who may have been at some time blessed with colleagues whom we could trust more securely than we can trust ourselves, to place anything like a restriction on a brother priest, especially one resting on so arbitrary a distinction as that between incumbent and curate in the Church of England. But in a large majority of cases, at least in small parishes, it would be a reasonable distinction that all cases of personal dealing should be left to the principal minister—the curate κατ' ἐξόχην: and that in any case, matters involving cases of conscience, or such a question as the use or non-use of sacramental confession, should be at once referred by the junior to the senior, by the irresponsible to the responsible person. In large populations, with a large staff of clergy, such a course would often be unnecessary and impossible. In these cases, whatever difficulty exists can only be met by some direct understanding and sanction on the part of the Bishop. It ought to be a fair presumption that no one is licensed to the chief cure of souls who is unfit for one of the responsibilities of the office. It is hard to put any restriction on a man, who is fit to be instituted at all, in the way of receiving whatever confidences his flock may choose to bring him. The case is surely different,

and may be differently treated without any derogation from the dignity of the priest's office, with those whom we know by the name of licensed curates. It is not necessary to advocate a separate order of spiritual guides. To the working of any such plan I am free to confess that I have never been able to see my way. It ought to be presumable that every parish has at least one minister of Christ in it who may be fairly confided in by his flock. At the same time, while humility remains a Christian virtue, parish priests will often be thankful to know of wiser brethren to whom they may refer cases which arise. And in London, and I dare say elsewhere, such unofficial referendaries are coming to be known. More men than people might think, more men perhaps than ought always to do it, are inclined—in curious contradiction to the popular impression of the priestly lust of influence—to send on to others all applications to receive confession, or to give private counsel in any shape, especially to women. If this is so, it can hardly be thought a grievance if assistant-curates, at all events under a certain age, should be required to have some sort of leave or licence before undertaking this branch of our ministry. And that this is one of the inferences drawn by all thoughtful minds not only from our own experience in the Church, but from the recent remarkable movement in London which has been referred to, is clear from the weighty and impressive letter which the Archbishop of Canterbury published on the subject. His Grace observed, with reference to the inquiry-rooms—"I cannot think that the difficult and delicate duty of thus ministering to anxious souls ought to be entrusted to any who have neither been set apart by the Church for this especial office, nor have given proof of such spiritual insight as may, in certain cases, be held to take the place in this particular of the regular call to the cure of souls." Common sense, experience, and Church principles, all corroborate this observation. The gist of my contention, then, is, that whether or not special clergymen should be officially recognised as persons to whom difficult cases, or any cases, might be sent if desired (which is another question, and quite an open one), it is certainly clear that some regulation is needed for the private ministrations of the younger parochial clergy, perhaps of us all. I will illustrate my point with a fact. Fifteen years ago, or more, when this matter had not been so much stirred, a young deacon was ordained priest on a Trinity Sunday in St Paul's Cathedral by the then Bishop of London, the present Primate. The ordination service is usually over about two. At three the new-made priest had an appointment to hear his first confession, and heard it. Against him or the penitent, or the wisdom of advising the making of this particular confession, I have, of course, no word to say. It may have been necessarily and wisely advised. But if any one thinks that the same can be said of the system—or no system—which permitted this young man to receive it, then I have no argument to use which would be likely to convince him. But for the fear of stirring warm feeling I could give further instances of the existing inconsistencies—to say the least of them—in the practice of the Church of England, which lead many men to feel strongly that some understanding and some regulations upon this point are imperatively called for.

5. But "it is against moral vigour and robust piety, and especially against English independence, to make religion depend in any way upon a priest." Do not scorn this objection. Let us pay all honour to true

independence of character if it be found in the paths of virtue and piety. But there is a good deal of manliness and independence of a sort, without any religion at all. And it may be doubted whether it is really the scruples of the manly *and* Christian that we need to consider in this matter. The mere prejudice of those who claim to be manly without being Christian we have certainly either to conquer or dispel.

Yet there is truth in the objection. Men may be pardoned if they really fear that an attempt is being made to bring back a mediæval system, or to borrow that which lingers ineffectual and vexatious, at least to men, on the Continent. Thank God, the really lofty English tone of God-fearing, dutiful men and women is a fine one, of which we should never speak slightingly nor treat it lightly.

Is it, these good folks ask, your real intention to send us all for some sort of spiritual manipulation, so to speak, first, perhaps, for conversion, then for more or less frequent and regular confession to a priest? And I am sure we are all agreed in answering to such frankly, "No; it is not, indeed, except so far as you yourselves desire it." Our desire is simply to protect your liberty herein, together with our own, on the one side as well as on the other. There is little fear, however, of too many people using confession, or going for personal guidance and counsel to a clergyman too often. The real risk is all the other way. How many are there whose consciences a serious self-examination would bring to a condition which they certainly could not and ought not to quiet without the humiliation of honest confession and "the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice;" or to whom it would reveal a confused and tangled moral condition, which nothing short of a clean sweep and a fresh start, by God's grace, with the help of clearer eyes than their own, will ever reduce to order and peace. Surely it is here that the root of the matter lies: the general absence of self-knowledge, and the neglect of self-examination, and the growing distaste for those interior graces which self-knowledge tends to bring, humility, modesty, unostentation, love of silence, choice of poverty, pursuit of purity, moderation, reserve, calmness, charity. Is Christianity to be commended to a nominally Christian society lapped in luxury, making haste to be rich, grasping at pomp and vanity, fulfilling all the lusts of the flesh, by taking our cue from it, and lowering the Church's flag to please the world? The fact is, that the desire for the state of mind and conscience to which private counsel and guidance in whatever form might lead is too often dead and gone. As one has said who has taught us many lessons, though he refuses some of our own:—

> We nod, and glance, and hurry by:
> And never once possess our souls before we die.

Hence religious converse is a weariness: self-examination and confession, in any form, as an act of piety, are beyond us altogether.

Yet I cannot doubt that if the occasional use of confession in some form, with or without a priest's aid, were looked upon in something like this light, as at once a relief, a refreshment, a new point of departure, as well as an exercise of penitential piety, to which a special blessing and reward is attached, there would not be the same amount of confusion and mistake on the subject as now prevails. If, for example, it were recommended, in whatever form, to all postulants for the ministry on the eve of their ordi-

nation, or at some convenient time beforehand, if only as a leave-taking of the old life and a becoming introduction to the new, there would not be the same amount of doubtfulness and hesitation, the same fears, born of inexperience, about its use by the Christian laity. We will concede as fully as you may wish that the world will never again go into the leading strings which once held it in. Shall we weep for this? Not if we believe in God. But does this carry with it what amounts to a suspension of the Christian ministry? Nay, indeed. And, lest it should, we want in our day of reawakened faith and piety the renaturalisation of some recognised form of private dealings with individual souls on the part of devout and experienced ministers of Christ, if our preaching to large congregations and our labour in vast populations is not to be almost thrown away; and, for my part, I do not see what we are to call it but confession.

6. Let me illustrate my meaning. Premising once more that liberty is the key-note of what I am contending for, and that this difference between liberty and compulsion in the matter is everything—then it may perhaps be granted that the educated and thoughtful, the pious and zealous, may be left to use their liberty as they will; though even they cannot very well use it, if no provision is made for its use. But how about those who are neither educated, nor thoughtful, nor pious, nor zealous, and who have no time or place for private exercises of devotion? Why, I will tell you. Incessant sermons which have no effect, which they must feel have no effect, which they come to believe were never meant to have any effect, sear their consciences at last like red-hot iron. Take the farm lad, growing into a man, well disposed, anything but depraved and hopeless, but stained by daily contact with bad language, foul talk, perhaps habits of drinking, with all manner of low-toned mischief, breathing an atmosphere of ungodliness, trained, perhaps (it is a common feature of some places), in a tradition of irreligion, not perhaps himself a great transgressor, yet conscious that the spell of all this evil is upon him; may be confirmed, having even in the best cases, perhaps, been once to the altar, but at this moment quite outside the circle of any real religion and vital godliness. So representative is such a case, so systematic is this dropping out of Church membership, that in many a case the poor clergyman knew as the boy passed out of his study the night before his confirmation that this would be his fate, and that he should never have a fair chance of speaking to him about his soul again; till at last whole parishes wear an unconscious air of passive resistance to religion, and good men find that after years of faithful work the confirmation list has added none, or almost none, to the roll of permanent communicants. Or, take the case of the town shopboy, the city clerk, or young factory hand, better educated perhaps, with more means of self-protection or self-improvement in his hands, but overwhelmed by his surroundings, overcome by pressure and example. Perhaps it is petty pilfering. Perhaps it is the organised dishonesty of a trade. Perhaps it is foul talk in his office (that supreme crime of irreverence against youth of which even heathen were ashamed, and for which some judgment is surely in store for the vicious middle-aged men of an evil and adulterous generation)! Perhaps it is habitual lying. Perhaps it is only the certain result of any or all of these—the disuse of his own prayers. But the lad, like the other, comes to church on Sunday—remorseful, but feeling unreal, and yet coming and

coming again, often getting as far as the spirit of the cry, "O shew Thou me the way that I should walk in, for I lift up my soul unto Thee." And then they hear sermons exhorting them in general terms to communion. How can they come? At any rate, they don't and won't. And having sat out one denunciation for not coming, they sit out the next and the next, and are practically excommunicate, and know it, and acquiesce in it. And who is to blame? Will you teach him self-examination? Will you tell him to pray? When and where will you do it, or he? Do you know anything of cottage homes and London lodgings? Depend upon it, careful acts of private self-examination, contrition, and prayer are the practice of the "fit, though few." No, if Christianity is ever again to be popular in England, and real where popular, which now in spite of appearances it is not, there must be much more personal help by the ministers of Christ to souls like these than many of us are as yet at all accustomed to. And to bring this about, example must be set and a habit created. "Go show thyself unto the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, for a testimony unto them." "Physician, heal thyself." "When He putteth forth His own sheep He goeth before them." We want it made possible for young Hodge in the country, and young Jones in the town, to feel it not unmanly, not unnatural, not an exceptional, but a common and a customary thing, for him to go to some one to help him to get straight again; to come to his parish priest, let us say once or twice in the year at least, for "personal guidance and counsel." And whether he kneels down beside him, and says simply (as I should think the better plan), "Thus and thus have I done, and I pray to God to have mercy on me, and forgive me my sins; and I ask you, sir, to pray for me, and to give me what correction and counsel you will, and, if you may, sir, to give me God's assurance of my pardon and acceptance with Him," —or whether he sits or stands, and says, "This or that is my danger or my besetting sin. I come to ask you to pray for me and with me against it, and to advise me how to fight against it, and to speak to me about it now and then;" and then they both kneel down and pray, and the minister comforts him out of God's Word, and he goes away at peace (and they both of them declare, if they please, to the end of their days that they know nothing of the practice of confession!)—I do not greatly care. One character will take one course, another the other, and in either case, "Wisdom is justified of her children."

And then if we thus deal with them, young Hodge and Jones will one day be middle-aged or even old men; and then they will not be shy, awkward, perhaps even defiant to us. Then, pray God, we or our successors may escape the misery of many of the deathbeds we now see—frightened, doubtful, half-sincere, longing to be honest, yearning for peace with God, but unfamiliar with either the idea or the practice of confession of sin in any shape; yet too honest to take all the words of comfort and consolation from the gospel, without at least some expression of repentance and contrition. And if I am asked why I thus speak chiefly of the young, I must reply:—

We are taking part in a revival, as we trust, of real and true religion. And we cannot always begin immediately and directly with the elderly and aged as a body. The habits and prejudices of a life forbid it. To urge such ways of religious life would probably do them and others more

harm than good. In really urgent cases, if they are taught the truth they will seek such help and blessing, of their own accord, according to their need. But with the young we may do much to train them, not, indeed, to lean upon us, or upon any man, but to use the ghostly comfort and counsel which the Church offers them, to lead them and help them to lean upon Christ.

And people of this class are not callous and unimpressionable. The sight of a dozen young farm labourers waiting above an hour in a vicarage garden in a remote village, on an autumn night, for their turn to go in and have a few words with a Mission preacher at the end of a Mission, is not unknown. And a year after, and again two years after, these men have been found faithful to their resolutions, open to the same influences, regular at church and communion. Sixty or seventy men and youths of the class described have been seen before now waiting till eleven o'clock at night in a great town church, at the end of a Mission, to receive a memorial card of the Mission, and each of them, or most of them, kneeling down with one of the missioners, before the others, solemnly to record some resolution, and ask for God's grace to keep it: a good many of them having previously gone a good deal further than that, of their own accord, in the way of opening their minds and consciences to the Mission preacher. And more experienced men have tales to tell of "a demand for personal guidance and counsel," of devout penitence, frank confession, "humble and hearty desire" for absolution, both in Missions and in parishes, of which these are but hints. Nor is this at all confined to the classes at which I have pointed as peculiarly needing and desiring such aid. It is difficult, I own, to attach much weight to the plea that we must be silent on such subjects in the hearing of the educated classes, whether the old or the young, because they are saturated with doubt about the Christian faith as a whole. If it were so, and there are grounds for thinking it an immensely exaggerated statement, it would surely indicate the need of more strictness, not more laxity, of Christian discipline, in their own case. But whatever be the social rank or degree of education, there is not much room for doubt that a "demand for personal guidance and counsel" is a sign of our times, as it has always been a symptom of a revival of religion from the Mission of St John the Baptist downwards. And it will not be wise for us to leave the supply wholly to other hands. No feature in the system of the Roman Catholic Church attracts so much. Speaking of the class with which I am now most conversant, I can only say that the solitary case of conversion to the Church of Rome from the artisan class that I have known was professedly, and, I believe, in fact, due to the desire for confession. I had never thought that any religious impression whatever existed, and was accordingly profoundly astonished to be told, "Perhaps, sir, if you had given me the same opportunity of 'personal guidance and counsel' you might have known it, and I might never have joined the Church of Rome!"

I venture to sum up my argument, and to submit the following propositions to the Congress:—

(1.) Missions have demonstrated the usefulness, and, in many cases, the necessity, for permanent Christian influence of some frank, personal communication between an inquirer or penitent and a Christian minister or other experienced Christian.

(2.) This is in accordance with reason, experience, Scriptural principles, and precepts, and the historical and traditional system of the Church. It is, in whatever sense, "the ministry of reconciliation."

(3.) This need, though prominent in Missions, is not confined to them; but is prominent then only as every natural and normal incident of the extension or deepening of the Christian life is prominent in every real attempt to spread the kingdom of Christ.

(4.) Such "personal guidance and counsel," having thus a permanent place in the work of the Church, is not to be looked upon merely as a permitted relief to the great sinner and the anxious inquirer only; nor, on the other hand, ought the use of it to be enforced in any way, or taught as indispensable to all.

(5.) Our Lord's commission to His Church, and the use made of His words in the ordinals of the Church, necessarily give some degree of divinely ordained or "sacramental" character to this "ministry of reconciliation" by His priests—which sacramental character it is perfectly possible and reasonable to maintain without derogating at all from the supremacy of those two "sacraments of the gospel," in which alone sign and thing signified were tied together by Christ Himself. (See Article XXV.)

(6). These general reasons being directly supported by the express terms of the Prayer-Book of the Church of England, in her invitations to private confession, and her offers and assurances of absolution; and some sense of the "benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice," being held and acted upon by all, or nearly all, of the greatest names amongst the Bishops and divines of the Reformed Church of England,—it is respectfully submitted to our fathers in God to-day, that in view of the general revival of religion, and the "demand for personal counsel and guidance" in particular, to which revivals or Missions have given rise, it is incumbent on them to take steps, which only they can take, for the training of all or some of the clergy in this necessary duty, and for the regulation of its exercise.

(7.) Finally, to sum up all the foregoing considerations, general and particular—however faithful be our teaching, however noble our worship, however practical our charity, unless we ministers of Christ are able, by some personal ministry of consolation and reconciliation to the sick, and sorrowful, and erring, and heavy-laden, to "bear one another's burdens," we do not "fulfil the law of Christ."

ADDRESSES.

Mr Nevile Sherbrooke.

My Lord,—I speak with diffidence before this assembly as being one of the youngest members of this Congress, and in the presence of many better acquainted with the subject before us than myself; but it has been my privilege, for some years past, to assist at Church Missions, and in similar movements, as a layman, and the few words that I shall say being the result of experience will, I trust, be not uninteresting to some. With reference to the word Revival, at the head of our subject, let us remember that "Revival" is God's work, the work of the Holy Ghost, and whilst in our Mission services we make every effort for their success, let us keep looking up

to God for the blessing. It is possible to have a Mission without a revival, but if we are seeking God's power we may expect blessing on our labour. A question now arises, What is our object in having Mission or revival services? Is it because others do so? No, we have a better object than that. Is it to fill our churches, or increase the number of communicants, or to raise the tone of our people? Yes! we expect all these, but our *primary* object is, that souls should be *saved*, by accepting God's gift of eternal life, through simple trust in the Lord Jesus Christ. Expecting and aiming at this end, let us do all we can to further it. Now comes the question, How is that to be effected? The answer is, By the simple proclamation of the gospel message, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; the preaching of the atonement, the finished work of Christ, clearly and tangibly, so that all, young and old, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, may be able to grasp the truth intelligently. After such a service as this we find that whilst many have been led into peace with God, others have been made anxious and are longing for a further word. What is to be done with them? "If we send them away hungering, it may be they will faint by the way." Do not the words of the Saviour to His disciples come to our minds? "They need not depart, give ye them to eat;" and if we have tasted of the Living Bread ourselves, it is our privilege to break it to others. Meet this desire then for further instruction, by having an After-meeting, especially intended for inquirers. It sometimes happens that anxious persons remain, who are too timid to be spoken to individually, or perhaps you have not sufficient workers. I have found in such cases the following plan useful. Deal with the whole body of people as with one soul. Tell them first that according to His promise the Saviour is present by His Spirit, ready to save any sinner who comes to Him. Speak to them in this way, "If you saw Him, sinner, with His bleeding hands and wounded side, what would you do? Would you turn away? Would you not rather go to Him, and throwing yourself at His feet, say, 'Lord, I have heard that Thou canst save sinners, I am a sinner, and I come to Thee;' and if you did so, would He receive you, do you think? yes! surely, He would say, Thy sins are forgiven thee, go in peace." I have sometimes found it helpful for all to repeat together aloud *from the heart to the Lord* the hymn "Just as I am, O Lamb of God, I come." Give them to understand that having truly come to Him, they *are* accepted. But, if possible, it is much better to deal with the anxious *individually*, and so meet their different difficulties. Select persons of known consistency of Christian character as workers, and adapt them, young men to speak to young men, ladies to ladies, and so on. The object now is not simply for the workers to talk to the anxious, but to point them to passages of Scripture bearing upon their spiritual state, which may prove a comfort and balm to their souls. I remember an instance of a soldier in Dublin, who was in deep distress under a sense of sin, finding peace with God, through reading St John iii. 36, and he went away from that meeting rejoicing in a sense of sins forgiven. The great advantage of bringing a text of Scripture before anxious souls is, that they can see the passage for themselves, and read it again when they get home, and thus their peace will be lasting, independent of feelings. Some may object to this mode of dealing with inquirers on the ground that it leads to excitement, but in fact it is to calm and quiet the soul, not to excite it. Another objection is, that this offer of a full, free, present pardon will lead to Antinomianism, but we find St Paul saying, Titus ii. 11, 12, "The grace of God that bringeth salvation unto all men hath appeared, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." Such being the case, may we not trust the grace which brings salvation to a soul, to teach that soul when saved how to walk? Let us trust God's message to do its own work.

The Rev. R. M. Grier, M.A., Vicar of Rugely.

If Missions are sanctioned, private interviews with the missioners can hardly be disallowed by the authorities of the Church. Oppressed with the burden of past transgressions, or troubled by the urgency of present temptations, many sinners naturally desire the advice of those by whom they have been awakened to serious thoughts of God. But who can give advice, unless he knows whom he is advising, and how can this be learned so well as from the lips of the man who seeks advice? There never has been but one Priest of whom it could be said, that "He needed not that any man should tell Him, for He knew what was in man."

Now, obviously, some revelations made to the missioner must be of a very delicate nature; for even if we grant that for a man (in the words of the Prayer-book) 'to open his grief,' may, as is now contended, mean nothing more than to say that he is troubled in mind, still if he is to receive ghostly counsel, it is manifest that he must explain how and why he is troubled, and to say the least he is very likely to tell what many a clergyman would far rather not hear. Ah! who, whether priest or layman, that has ever hungered or thirsted after righteousness, but has longed at times for the wings of a dove, that he might flee away from all the polluting suggestions of the world and be at rest. But this cannot be. God leaves us in the world that we may improve the world. Consequently there must be some in the world who know it not merely as it seems to be but as it is. And who should these be, if not the ambassadors of Christ specially set apart for the conversion of the world?

This position, I know, is not undisputed. It is fiercely attacked by some who know the world only too well, and by many who do not know the world at all. To the former I have nothing to say. Words addressed to them would be simply wasted. For they are themselves one chief reason why ready access to the minister of Christ should always be allowed. No wonder, then, that they so earnestly demand that it should be strictly prohibited. But if the latter knew as I know, how terrible are the temptations to which the young are frequently exposed in this Christian country, and in many a home reputed highly respectable, they would not try to rob them of such aid as may be obtained from the counsels of the trusted minister of Christ.

But I would not be misunderstood. I am not of opinion that a missioner should require all the details of all the sins of those who seek his help to be laid before him. No wise man would do anything of the kind. Indeed it is rarely necessary for a missioner to ask questions. Sometimes perhaps when some wrong has to be redressed or danger guarded against, he may want further information; but as a rule those who are sincerely desirous to avail themselves of his counsel will tell him spontaneously all that he needs to know. But it must not be supposed that the sins which drive men to seek the help of the ministers of God, are all of the same grave kind. It is well for him they are not. Often and often do those who are far holier than himself put him to shame by the severity of their self-reproaches. I know that it is said, that inasmuch as the acknowledgment of sin is a sign of weakness, such persons ought not to be allowed to acknowledge it; but trained in a Church, which teaches the very best of her children daily to declare that there is no health in them, they are not 'careful in this matter,' and unconsciously in their humility, they minister to the spiritual wants of the priest of God. To him it would be a cruel wrong only to allow those who have fallen into presumptuous sins, or are struggling with them, to seek his help: in other words, to give him a real insight into such characters only as are worse than his own. This would be to lower his conception of attainable human

virtue : to leave upon his mind a worse impression of his fellow-men than they deserve. Whereas when he is permitted to read the secrets of hearts purer than his own, and of lives nobler and truer than his own, he is encouraged to fresh efforts in the service of God, and in some measure compensated for any evil that he may receive from the confidences of great offenders. It would, too, I am convinced, be most unwise, even if it were possible, to limit the frequency of such intercourse as I have spoken of, to the occasion of a Mission, and to say that it may be permitted once or twice in a life-time, but should never be repeated. For frequently the temptations which induce men to ask for help and guidance continue. Frequently, too, those who have escaped for a season from the bondage of sin are re-enslaved, and are then very apt to imagine that they are hopelessly lost. Relapses tend to beget despair, and despair is death. Every clergyman, who has in any degree won the confidence of his people, knows that when the will of a man has been weakened, or his perception of truth obscured by a long course of transgression, it would be madness to deprive him immediately on his repentance—it might be madness ever to deprive him—of any spiritual help that he has received. He is maimed (our Lord has so described him), and, consequently, may need assistance to the close of life. And let no one say that the clergyman in assisting him, puts himself in the place of Christ. God forbid. Like the Church, like the Bible, like the Sacraments, like all the ordinances of the Church, he is a means to an end ; a means to bind man to Christ. In Him indeed we all are members one of another. Only to the priest it surely more especially belongs to draw others and bind them to Christ.

Certainly, however, it is not every clergyman who should be allowed to fill the office of spiritual guide. Men of experience and wisdom should, I think, be selected for it, by those who bear rule in the Church. This, if I mistake not, is the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury ; at least he implied as much in the letter, which he wrote with reference to the recent Mission of Messrs Moody and Sankey in this country. One other caution I would give. Private intercourse between a clergyman and individuals should not take place as a rule in private rooms. Against this bad practice, the English people have a perfect right most vigorously to protest. It is plain common sense that the intercourse should be as public as the nature of it will allow. Messrs Moody and Sankey have proved to us that this is quite possible. They listened to what others had to tell them, in the presence of crowds of people. Religious confidence, given in the private and informal way now suggested by some eminent men, would be fraught with mischief. I can conceive of nothing more dangerous ; and I venture to say, with the utmost respect for them, that if they had been parish priests, of wide and long experience, they never would have made the suggestion. It is true, no doubt, as is contended, that a distinction must be drawn between confidence and confession. But it should be remembered that all the dangers which attach to the one attach to the other also. Does confession ever weaken the character? If it does so, it does so because it is confidence. Does confession ever promote sentimentalism? If it does so, it does so because it is confidence. Does confession ever interfere with the sacredness of home life? If it does so, it does so because it is confidence. Does confession bring priest and penitent into close relationship? If it does so, it does so because it is confidence. In short, confession is only dangerous in so far as it is confidence. To be safe at all it must be formal and religious. In other words, confession is confidence, guarded from some of its perils. For it is, believe me, one thing to listen to delicate revelations in the privacy of a study : it is quite another to listen to them in the house of God, vested as a minister of God, with everything around you to remind you of God, and with all the safeguards of a religious act.

Some years ago, a clergyman of my acquaintance was constantly solicited for advice by a young and unhappy wife. He often received her into his house. She was closeted with him occasionally for half-an-hour at a time. At length, finding that he could be of no real service to her, he succeeded in discouraging her visits, and he had reason ere long, from circumstances which transpired, to congratulate himself on having done so. Soon afterwards her husband died. The lady was in distress, and wrote to him apparently in a strain of the deepest penitence for his advice. She wished to see him; she felt how wrongly she had acted. What was he to do? One thing he was determined he would not do. He would not again admit her to a private interview in his house; and yet what right had he to refuse counsel to one who sorely needed it, and sympathy to one who might now be sincerely penitent? There was, it seems to me, only one course open to him. He wrote and told the lady that he might be found in church at a certain hour, on a certain day; if she was really contrite, she might come and seek his counsel then; but he declined, for reasons which he gave her, to have any further communication with her elsewhere. The lady troubled him no more. I mention this circumstance, as I could mention many others, to show that it is not so much confession, though it is everywhere condemned, as the informal confidences which are everywhere approved, that constitute the most serious danger incident to the awakened religious life of the present day.

I have said nothing upon the subject of absolution. Most Mission priests will, I think, admit that they have had to deal with cases in which the exercise of this power has proved invaluable. But I do not think it necessary to enter at length upon the subject. For it is not to absolution in itself, but to absolution as a means of encouraging confession, that the majority of the people of this country take exception. Comparatively few object to it when pronounced in the daily service of the Church, and these few are for the most part religious people, who must ere long come to see that it no more interferes with the prerogative of Christ to profess to forgive, than to profess to convert in His name. It is no more true to say that it is the essence of sacerdotalism that man can pardon man, than to say that it is the essence of evangelicism that man can convert man. Man, we know, can do neither, but God can do both through man. And one proof that His Church may absolve in His name, is to be found in the fact that He does give health and strength in it; He does still say to the spiritually diseased, "Arise, and walk."

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. J. G. M. Townsend, B.A., Vicar of Searby with Owrnby, Lincolnshire.

There was, probably, never any time in the history of the Church of England since the Reformation, when this subject of religious revivals had so prominent a place in the mind of the people. Now this revival movement has been carried on upon two principles, both of which are familiar to us. One is through the earnest preaching of such men as those who have come over from America of late, and have created such a sensation among us; the other is through the agency of Mission priests using those ordinances which Christ has placed in their hands, either in the twelve days' Mission or in a permanent pastoral charge. I am not going to compare these two modes together, or to consider which is the better, but I desire to call attention to one fact connected with those two principles, and that is,

that whereas in the one case the world smiles upon the efforts of the revivalist, and smiles at itself for taking part in the revival services in the Agricultural Hall at Islington on the other hand, we have seen a Mission-priest driven, for six weeks together, by a side wind, from that position before God's altar, in which the Reformed Church of England had placed him; and this to the great satisfaction of the public, and of the "Christian world," whatever that may mean. Now, there must be some important reason for these distinctions, and why the world is stirred up against the one, and smiles upon the proceedings of the other. With the liberty which our President has conceded to us, of expressing freely our opinions, so long as they are within due bounds, I will venture to express mine as to the cause of that difference. I believe the cause to be that in the theology of the revivalist there is no right place found for those divine ordinances which Christ has ordained in His Church, and which the Church of England tells us are necessary to our salvation—of one of which our blessed Lord has declared that without it we cannot enter into the kingdom of God, and of the other, He has said that except we do it we have no life in us. Now, why, I ask, should the world be stirred up against the American, or similar revivals? ("Question.") The family lawyer would not be anxious upon hearing that there was a claimant to the family estates, if he knew that that claimant's title-deeds possessed neither signature nor seal; and the signature and the seal of the Christian covenant are the sacraments of the gospel. ("Question.") One further opinion I will venture to express, and that is as to the cause of these differences of teaching; it is because men fail to apprehend the theological fact that the spiritual life has as real an existence as the natural life, and is derived from a spiritual and real union with our incarnate Lord; and that as birth and food are in natural life but means of its existence, and as health and strength are in natural life but evidences of that existence, so also those fruits of the Spirit—Faith, Hope, and Charity—are not themselves the spiritual life, while they are necessary proofs of its vitality.

The Rev. C. F. Lowder.

The reader of the first paper described to us four different courses which might be taken with regard to anxious inquirers in the After-meetings: he finished by asking which of these is the best. I hope you will allow me to say a few words to explain why I conceive the last to be the best—namely, that which is best known by the name of sacramental confession. God forbid that I should cast any slur upon the other ways. In the hands of experienced persons, of earnest, consistent Christians, very much indeed may be done in the other ways; but when we remember that the object of the Inquiry-room, or the After-meeting, is first to help to bring souls to Jesus Christ, and to build up those souls afterwards that they may walk in the consistent way of the Christian life; and when we remember that we act as ministers of Christ's Church, and that the very idea of the Church is sacramental, for unless the Church is sacramental the Church is nothing—("No, no," and cheers)—

The President—I must beg the meeting to understand that only five minutes are allowed to the speaker; therefore I must request that there may be no expression of opinion at all, except what may be given at the end of the address. It is too much to cut short the speaker's time by interrupting him.

The Rev. C. F. Lowder—When we remember that we are admitted into Christ's Church by baptism; that we are strengthened and refreshed in Christ's Church by the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and His Blood; that we are confirmed with the sacramental gift of confirmation when the seal of the Lord is set upon us; and when we consider that in our ordination the Bishop's hands were laid upon us in that most solemn act of the priestly life—then I say that if we wish to build up souls in this the sacramental

life of Christ's Church, we naturally turn to that sacramental gift which is given in sacramental absolution. When we were ordained priests of Christ's Church, when the Bishop laid his hands upon us and said, "Receive the Holy Ghost—whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," we must use that gift; it was given to us for use, and we are therefore bound to help souls by means of that sacramental gift; and if we consider that we are thus building them up, and leading them in the way of Christ's Church, in the way set before us, in the way which may best lead them to consistent lives in the Church, then we should feel that the grace of absolution is just the grace which they need, and which it is our bounden duty to impart to them. When we consider, also, that in subsequent confession and absolution we are really doing that which is our priestly work; that when persons come to us in their penitence, in their sorrow for their sins; when they come to seek us as they should find us, in the church, then that time which we devote to their spiritual comfort is the best spent time; we waste no time about trifles; we are not going about our parishes talking about worldly matters; they come to us to speak of their souls; we know they come for that purpose; we give ourselves up to them for that purpose, and that purpose is attained if God's blessing be on the work of the prudent and pious priest. I am sure that my brethren will find that such a time is really the best spent. I wish we could only have guidance in this respect. Oh! how I wish that our Bishops had embraced that golden opportunity when they were asked to regulate and to guide the priests of Christ's Church in regard to the hearing of confessions and this very arduous work. Oh! how I wish they had answered us in a kind fatherly manner, and shown us what we were to do and what we were not to do, because this is a most difficult work, a work in which we need much help and guidance.

The Rev. G. W. Weldon.

I THINK we are all agreed with Mr Grier, when he says that confidential communications should not take place between our people and their clergymen in private, but should take place in as public a manner and as public a place as possible. But if the removal of confidential communications from the private study to the house of God be regarded as absolutely necessary and essential before a communicant can be admitted to the Sacrament, which was the argument of the last speaker, I, as a priest of Christ's Church, must say that there is no such thing required by our Church as sacramental confession as necessary to the Holy Communion. I hold in my hand a statement from a very distinguished clergyman of the Church of England, and I will read it to show you what I mean. It is a letter addressed by him to one of his penitents, in which he says, "I know no other way by which mortal sin committed after baptism is forgiven except by sacramental confession and absolution." I, as a priest of Christ's Church, deliver my conscience when I state that the Church of England knows no such doctrine as that, and that if we are to be true to the doctrines of our beloved Church; if we desire to defend that Church from attacks from without and from within, we must be true to the teaching of the New Testament, and the doctrines and discipline of our beloved Church, and believe that there is but one pardoning Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ; but one sacrifice for sin, that upon the Cross of Calvary; but one altar, that upon which Christ Jesus died. When Mr Grier spoke of Evangelicalism and Sacerdotalism, and gave his description of them, he was perfectly entitled, as we all are, I trust, under the spirit of honest conviction, to hold whatever opinion our consciences suggest; but I understand by Evangelicalism this, that no prayer, no praise, no confession of sin can go up to the Throne of Grace except through the mediation of Jesus Christ; and that no grace or blessing can come down to us from that Throne except

by the same line of communication. Whereas, by Sacerdotalism we understand that the priest is placed between the sinner and the Saviour. I am simply stating what is defined, and time forbids my going into it further. This is the question — How shall our souls have the love of God within them? How shall they be revived, so that they shall worship God in spirit and in truth? All revival that does not consist in introducing into the heart the love of the Lord Jesus Christ, and for His sake the love of all around us, is not worthy of the name of revival. I am devotedly attached to the Church of England; I believe that it is more in accordance with the nature of man, the Scriptures of God, the structure of society, and the Apostolic model than any other Church upon this earth. I admire its moderation, and full and comprehensive spirit: it is what our poet has applied to the noblest river in our land—

> Though deep yet clear, though gentle yet not dull,
> Strong without rage, without o'erflowing, full.

I say that in the Church we have machinery, under the Holy Spirit, admirably adapted to reviving in our land real God-fearing religion.

Dr Allen.

There are many diseases which we medical men are powerless to treat. There is many a mind weakened, with insanity staring it in the face, and the cause of that is sin, habitual sin. It is only the priest who can treat those cases. Unless the Divine Hand saves these people, we medical men are entirely powerless; and the benefit of confession, and the blessing of absolution, in those cases is very great. Therefore I would urge confession and absolution on the medical ground alone, knowing what comfort they have been to many a soul; knowing how absolution given by the priest has encouraged that soul to go on struggling against sin, and that soul, please God, has been saved. Where the sin is habitual, surely the confession must be more or less habitual, because the sinner will slip many times before he is able to get on to a sure foundation. Therefore those who are afraid of priestly absolution I would exhort not to judge of the question in the harsh way in which they seem disposed to do, but to look at it from every point of view, and to see whether there is not a great deal to be said on its behalf, as by that means both body and soul may be saved.

The Ven. Archdeacon Reichel.

I have not the pleasure of Mr Lowder's acquaintance, but for many years past I, with many of whom he has probably never heard, have followed with the greatest interest and the greatest admiration his self-denying and zealous life in the East of London. This meeting will therefore not believe that, if I venture to differ from Mr Lowder upon any point, I am actuated by any other motive than a zeal for truth, entirely abstracted from all party considerations. If I understood Mr Lowder aright, he made what he termed sacramental confession to depend for its authority upon the words of our Saviour, which are now repeated by our Bishop over the head of every priest whom he ordains—"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained." I

believe I have not misunderstood Mr Lowder. If that be the case, we are unhappily driven to this conclusion—that for twelve hundred years after Christ there was no power such as Mr Lowder now supposes to be exercised by the priests of the Church of God in remitting sins; for it is a simple historical fact, quite capable of being proved—and I speak upon it with knowledge from personal investigation—that for more than twelve hundred years after Christ those words were never repeated over any priest when he was ordained by the Bishop, and, what is more, they are not to this day repeated over any priest in the whole of the Greek Church, the Russian Church, or the Eastern Churches at large. It is only in the Roman Catholic Church and in our Church that they are used in the form of ordination. All that I wish to intimate to Mr Lowder and to my clerical brethren, and to this meeting at large, is, that they must be very careful before they put what they call sacramental confession upon the basis of a text which the whole Church of God for twelve hundred years did not suppose to be applicable to that purpose.

The Rev. E. H. Bickersteth.

Our discussion has been driven to the concluding words of the subject before us; but it was intended to be based on "Revival Movements." As one who has been privileged to have three Missions in my own parish, and as one who has had the great responsibility of conducting several Missions in the parishes of my brethren, I cannot but desire to bear my humble testimony to the immense blessings from God which I believe have rested upon these Church Missions. I know that the Mission has often brought the pastor into a close personal relationship with the Church workers, which has been beyond all price. I know, as a missioner, when I have come to a parish to conduct a Mission, that God has been pleased to use some of the first words He has put into my lips for the discovery of hearts to themselves. I remember one now who in a large mercantile town came to me in the course of a Mission, utterly broken down under a sense of sin; and, when I asked what had been the occasion of it, the answer was, "Oh, it was your first address to the Church workers: I felt that I was not at peace with God, and yet I was going and telling others that they ought to come to the Mission." I am sure that during the course of these Missions the intercourse with those who come, without any exercise of sacerdotal absolution, has yet been productive of great benefit. I do not believe that England will have the confessional. England abhors the confessional, and will not have it. The essence of pastoral intercourse is freedom; the essence of the confessional is priestly enchainment, and England will not have it. I speak from close acquaintance with a number of business men in London, barristers and others, and with one heart and mind they abhor the Roman confessional. But I am quite sure that the personal intercourse into which we are drawn by these Church Missions is that for which we shall bless God, and for which countless souls will bless God through all eternity. I shall never forget one man coming to me in Sunderland, with a heart overflowing with thankfulness; he had been brought to God through the ministry of the great and blessed evangelist Wilkinson, and he said to me, "Oh, sir, my wife and my son have found Christ under the words you spoke." Nor is it only during the Mission; but the correspondence which springs up after the Mission between the missioner, by the sanction of the pastor, and those to whom he has spoken the words of life, is sometimes invaluable; therefore I do thank God from my heart for these Church Missions.

The Ven. Archdeacon Emery.

Whatever differences of view we may have upon certain points of this discussion, I think all of us must be most thankful at the tone of the whole meeting, and at the spiritual way in which the subject has been brought before us. In an experience now of many years' ministry, intermixing as it has been my duty and privilege to do with men of all classes of religious opinion, it has always seemed to me that our differences were mostly differences of words; that we have words sometimes put forth which, if we would only try to come together to interpret them, or only try to carry out the principle underlying them, would probably effect perfect peace and unity amongst us. I do not suppose we shall ever come to perfect unanimity, for from the nature of our mental organisation, from our religious education and the circumstances around us, there will always be differences of opinion on some essential points; but we have heard to-day from the papers which have been read, that there has been a great drawing together of different classes of religious views. It is true that my dear friend Mr Lowder has used the phrase "sacramental confession," which seemed to some to indicate, I suppose, grievous error; at any rate, they did not seem to understand it; but at the same time, as I said, I do believe, even in a case like that, it is to a great extent a question of words; and if not, I say there is this great use in the open discussion of such a subject in the face of one another and in the fear of God, that those who have held, or those who seem to hold, extreme views, learn the views of others, and gradually get corrected. If I may say so, remember the deadness there was in former days, and the revived spiritual life there is amongst us. We have had an actual confession by Mr Grier, in his remarkable paper, that certain friends, dearly beloved in the Lord, have, in his opinion, in certain cases, gone beyond the bounds of wisdom. I am quite sure that when we come, as I trust we all shall come, to read this debate in the published report, and prayerfully think it over, I believe we shall come to the conclusion that there is a great drawing together of opinion amongst us all. I hold that the Church of England does give a power of absolution to the minister of Christ; it cannot be denied; and although I am opposed to habitual confession, I do think there are times and seasons when the opening of the heart to the minister is most useful, and when also the solemn pronouncing the Absolution in the Master's name, and according to the Master's principles, if I may so speak of His willingness to absolve, does bring peace to the soul. I will conclude with this instance. Years ago I used to visit the Cambridge Hospital; and I saw a poor person there who was greatly distressed with spiritual difficulties. I investigated as far as I could the life of that person; great difficulty was experienced, and at the last it came to this—I did what the Church of England allowed me to do under the special circumstances; that really repentant sinner desired me to use my office, and believing that my Master would accept the ministerial act of His servant done in faith and humility, I did pronounce what the Church of England allowed me to pronounce, that that person, if truly repentant, was absolved through Christ.

The Earl of Harrowby.

His Lordship has complained that few of the laity have taken part in the present discussion, and I suppose he has picked me out as the representative of the lay body; and in one respect I suppose I may claim to be so, for I believe I am the oldest layman present. In regard to these revivals I have not much to say; I have had little part in them; I have watched them from a distance, of course, like other people, and with much interest, and I believe from all revivals of every kind good of some sort

will of necessity follow. They stir up the attention of mankind, sluggish and apathetic as it usually is, to spiritual things. They stir up perhaps only to spasmodic action, but it does shake them for a moment at least out of their lethargy. Whether the best means are always pursued I do not say, but at any rate I welcome such movements, and wish that God's grace may attend them. With regard to the other point which has been raised, I hope you will permit me to say one or two words. Archdeacon Emery has told us, we sometimes differ about words, when we are not differing about things. But there are occasions when we differ about things—and this is one of them. When we are told that we are not to interfere between the parish priest and his people ; that we are not to prevent men from pouring their griefs into his ear, and asking his counsel, I think every man and woman here present will say, let that practice be continued and increased. But when we come to the other question, are we to have sacramental confession, that is quite another thing. It is not a difference of words, it is a difference of things ; in fact, the difference between English religion and Roman religion. I say there is no difference between Romish confession and sacramental confession as practised, I do not know how often, but at least by too many priests of the English Church. Now I would say to my brethren and my sisters here present, as the words of the oldest layman present, beware, above all things, of auricular confession. If you wish to undermine the purity of your household, if you wish to undermine the individual character of the English Protestant Reformed Religion, if you wish to prevent a man from consulting his own Bible and his own conscience, then look to auricular confession. I recollect a few words of a former diocesan here when the question was raised before him. He said, "If it comes to auricular confession, the English Church does not encourage it; it permits it in two cases; it permits it on the bed of death, it permits it to the man who cannot relieve himself of the burden of a grievous sin, and who comes in his distress to his pastor for advice, assistance, and absolution ; absolution, mind you, by the word of God, but in other cases," the late Bishop of Lichfield said, and I have no doubt it will be confirmed by the present, "The English Church recognises no confession with absolution except in those two cases. I say beware of what is called Sacramental Confession. It is a practice which is most plausible and most seductive ; everybody would like to lean upon somebody else's conscience, rather than upon his own, and upon the grace of God assisting him ; but it is a fatally dangerous practice, and if I may be allowed to say one last word to my countrymen and countrywomen, it is this, above all things preserve the purity of your own individual conscience ; ask advice of your clergy, but do not let them say, 'You shall not come to communion or to confirmation unless I admit you through confession.'"

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, 7th OCTOBER.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Manchester took the Chair at half-past Two o'clock.

ORGANISATION OF CATHEDRAL AND CAPITULAR INSTITUTIONS IN LARGE TOWNS.

PAPER.

Mr Beresford Hope, M.P.

The increase of the Episcopate has lately become a prominent subject of interest to Churchmen in Parliament and elsewhere. It is important that in following out the realisation of this practical need, they should not neglect the kindred question of the organisation, particularly in large towns, of the system under which the Episcopate can most healthily work. I merely point to the total absence of any provision for such organisation in the St Alban's Bishopric Act, and pass on. A Bishop, particularly one called to preside over a fresh See, and especially a See in a large town, without Capitular and Cathedral institutions, is a general without his staff; or if you please, a sovereign without constitutional forms. The difficulty most likely to beset the man who undertakes to organise a Chapter is not that of finding work for dignitaries, but of making a good selection out of the various classes of work towards which the members of the Chapter may be made available. Assuming the Cathedral built, the conduct of worship in its highest type comes first. Frequent and stirring preaching comes close after. The pastoral charge of individual souls is a heavy burden. Education, under many forms, from the direct training of the choir and the regulation of the Diocesan College to the general supervision of upper, middle, and elementary schools throughout the Diocese, asserts its supreme importance. Diocesan administration is emphatically a Capitular duty. In the Chapter, too, the Bishop will find his best friends and counsellors in the always delicate and often painful exercise of paternal discipline in its various phases of examination, consultation, and, if needful, admonition. I am not referring to cases in which Parliament may kindly have relieved the Bishop of spiritual attributes. Much must, after all, be left on which he will and ought to have to act upon his inherent powers, and in such circumstances he may need and gladly welcome the help of such a body as this Chapter.

But besides all these considerations, there is a risk which may easily be incurred in organising the Chapter of a Diocese, where the See town is a large one. It is easy to forget, that important as that town may be, it is not the whole Diocese, and that the country portions, as well as other

smaller though populous places in it, have their claims both to be represented and to be looked after. Hence it follows that the newly-constituted Chapter must be somewhat numerous; that is, it must resemble the greater Chapters of our existing Cathedrals of the old foundations. Another inference is, that while residence must be the principle of the lesser or directly working Chapter, perpetual residence should not be the rule of all the members of the entire body. Common sense and the responsibilities of corporate duties dictate that those members of the Chapter specially concerned with the work of the Cathedral should generally reside, such as the Dean, the Precentor, and the Chancellor who would preside over the Choir School, and the head of the Diocesan College. On the other hand, I see the advantage of making certain canonical offices, such as School Inspector, possibly tenable with a country cure of souls, while its holder should only be compelled to a limited residence. Similar advantages must accrue to the Diocese at large in the highly trained residentiaries taking occasional turns of rural preaching, and to the town in otherwise beneficed Prebendaries being called up for their turns of Cathedral preaching. There are yet other arrangements which must be co-ordinated with a Chapter of the future. The Diocesan Synod of Clergy, and the mixed Conference of Clergy and Laity, are essential for the healthy circulation of the Church's life-blood. How, then, are we to ensure that these representations of the entire Diocese should be really working bodies, and yet not trench upon the functions of the Chapters? Obviously by providing that the Chapter shall be the Bishop's ordinary Committee for preparing the business to be brought before the Synod or Conference, as well as the executive for carrying out the deliberations of those bodies.

So much for the general principles which should regulate the constitution of fresh Chapters. Let us now, in accordance with them, construct a Chapter for some new Diocese, whose Bishop has been planted in a populous See town. If a church already exists important enough to be the Cathedral, so much the better—provided that the patronage of the living can be acquired and absorbed into the new organisation. If, however, no edifice can be found worthy of the distinction, I must urge very earnestly that the building of a Cathedral is not a matter of indifference, or merely the gratification of artistic taste. It is not a work that can be indefinitely put off on the plea of more pressing calls. It is simple idleness to allege, that in a community possessed of an Episcopal government and a Liturgical system of worship, the great church of the Bishop and of the Diocese is not an important element. I am exonerated from having to offer any suggestions upon the form and arrangement of this Cathedral, from having virtually travelled over the ground last year at the Brighton Congress in handling the building of a large town church. A Cathedral, no doubt, would require something more, but the general principles would be the same.

Now for the Chapter. While securing to the Bishop a place and a voice in the Chapter very different from that which survives in mediæval foundations, I would not abolish the dignity of Dean. There will be plenty for him to do; and it is quite consistent with the highest respect for the Episcopate to say, that the presence in the Diocese of a presbyter of exceptional rank, next to the Bishop, is a good constitutional balance. There should be no question as to the Bishop's right to preside in the

Chapter when present, otherwise the Dean will take the chair. His duties will be those of general supervision, and they do not therefore call for particular enumeration. The Precentor will be responsible for the constant choral worship. In a properly-appointed Cathedral he would naturally be assisted by, and have the direction of, the Vicars Choral. I should, however, doubt whether these ought to be members of the Chapter; at least that position might be reserved for the Precentor and the Succentor, of whom the latter might be charged with the special supervision of the Lay Clerks, of whom more hereafter. The choir boys ought of course to be boarders at the Cathedral School, and what that ought to be will be at once understood if described as a good middle school. The other clerical masters in that school could hardly claim to a seat and voice in the Chapter, but they would be attached to the Cathedral by the assignment of stalls. The Treasurer would have modern duties in connection with the finances of Diocesan or Town Societies. Where a Diocesan Theological College existed, its head would be a Canon, and the other tutors also attached to the Cathedral. I now reach an institution, the organisation of which in our various Dioceses would be of great practical benefit, I mean the College of Mission Preachers, intended sometimes to fill the Cathedral pulpit; sometimes to go where they were sent through the Diocese—men who, in connection with their preaching, should be ready and able to discharge the delicate duties of the individual pastorate. This college would have its headquarters close to the Cathedral, which it would regard as its ordinary church for public worship; but it would require an internal organisation of its own, affiliated to the Chapter by its superior, and possibly also, the second in command, being *ex-officio* Canons. The religious inspector of the public elementary schools of the Diocese must be a Canon, possibly also the secretary of Diocesan Societies. In a large town where wide but often misdirected intellectual activity and much poverty necessarily exists, personal benevolence might well be hallowed and regulated by adding to the Chapter a promoter of workmen's clubs, popular lectures, and so on, as well as material Charities. The development of the corporate life of devotion and charity among women might lead to the creation of a sort of chaplain-general of sisterhoods, who would naturally be one of the Capitular body. There still would remain that class of Canons, to whom we have already referred, who without particular duties were selected *honoris causâ*, as distinguished representatives of the Diocesan clergy, alike from the towns and the rural districts. On these, as I have said, I should impose short and easy conditions of residence.

I have been, as will be seen, treating up till now of the clerical members of the Cathedral Body; but I attach equal importance to the lay organisations which must cluster round the Mother Church. Foremost among these must come the College of Lay Clerks. It is, of course, impossible to carry on a Cathedral service without a back-bone of paid choir men, whose time belongs to their employers. But besides these, in the interests of general devotion, a Cathedral which shall really leave its mark on a town of the present age must be largely and cheerfully served by voluntary helpers; while these and the paid clerks must agree to work together as one institution under some reasonable code of statutes. I have suggested that the Succentor, who would in that case be a Canon, might be charged with the care of the Lay Clerks. The Choir School may be made

the pivot of much important work besides the provision of the necessary complement of boys' voices for the services, or of the good education, during their service, of those particular boys. St Paul's, London, has just shown what may be done with the Choir School. In a provincial town I believe that the school might often, and advantageously, take the shape of a middle school, at which all the pupils need not be choristers. If so, and if the place in choir were held up as an honour, and the choristers proper treated as a kind of foundation, a new element of popularity might be introduced into the relations of Church and town. I should also look forward to some provision for helping the most promising scholars on to the university. Some of its sons, of whom the church of England may be most proud, have come from Cathedral schools, and the race is one which may well be encouraged. There are many other lay societies which would naturally grow up under the fostering care of a working Chapter, but I have no time to expatiate upon them.

It will be seen that the ideal Chapter which I have proposed for your consideration in a large town is one which is, to a considerable extent, founded upon a variety of institutions, many of them clerical and possessing a sort of Capitular character of their own, all existing round the Cathedral, and each represented in the Chapter by its leading members. Each would thus retain its freedom of internal action, while all would be brought under the regulating influence of the great central corporation. Still, however many and serviceable these institutions may be, the Cathedral does not exist merely to be their rendezvous. It is the Church of the whole Diocese; and I claim that within its choir every priest of that Diocese may find, whether of right or of graceful concession, a stall ready for his occupation. On great days, of course, when the whole Diocese gathers, this may not be possible; but I am talking of the habitual incidents of ordinary worship. Such a custom as, for instance, that the Dean might invite any incumbent of the Diocese who presented himself before a service to read a lesson, might seem a trifle; but it would be something which would, in a practical and kindly way, show to the clergy at large that they and their Cathedral belonged to each other, of which fact at present the tangible evidence is incomplete. After all, sympathy and co-operation are at the bottom of the Capitular system, and they ought to thrill through it from the altar of the Cathedral to that of the homeliest parish church in the remotest angle of the Diocese.

Let me conclude with a supplementary suggestion. In any Diocese, old or new, where sizeable places exist, in addition to the See town, it would be well worth while to create, by conventional arrangement or otherwise, a Chapter or quasi-Chapter as near as possible upon the lines of that which exists at the Cathedral itself. It would also be very much to the advantage of the working of the Church in those places, if the Diocesan could so arrange his visits as to ensure his spending some continuous portion of time in each such town. Passing visits have their usefulness; but the Episcopate would become a reality as it has not hitherto been, if each considerable place could realise that it was, in fact, the Bishop's town for a given period, and that its principal church was from time to time used by him as his Cathedral.

ADDRESS.

The Dean of Chester.

A REGRET, which I fully share, has recently been expressed by high authority, that a more competent person than myself has not been selected to occupy this place in the present discussion. That authority was the *Guardian* newspaper. I find some comfort, however, in the fact that, three years ago, the same newspaper, in reference to the very subject under discussion, had expressed an approval of me so high as almost to amount to a panegyric. Hence, while recognising the justice of the latter criticism, I hope the audience will accept the earlier, and thus listen favourably to my remarks. Our subject is the Organisation of the Episcopate in reference to large towns and in connection with Capitular institutions. We live in an age of great cities. St Paul conducted his missionary work with special regard to great cities. If Christianity was a living and aggressive religion, it must, according to its genius, attack primarily the strong places of the earth. Each very large town ought to have its own Bishop. Each such town was conscious of its importance, and ought to be. It knew that its vigour and prosperity had made it a power in the country. It was just there that a Bishop ought to be placed. Such was the view of the late Dr Arnold. "Every large town," he said, "should necessarily be the seat of a Bishop. The addition of such an element in the society of a commercial or manufacturing place would of itself be a great advantage." Such an arrangement would do much in assuaging party spirit, and in eliciting the sympathies and ascertaining the wishes of the laity. There was another view, too, of the matter, and one closely affecting the interests of the clergy, which was often overlooked. Nothing did so much as efficient Episcopal superintendence for the augmentation of small benefices. It seems to me that the merging of the Episcopal Fund in the Common Fund has been a great mistake. This change has probably involved a loss instead of a gain to the parochial clergy. If funds available for the increase of the Episcopate were now in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commission, some of our present difficulties might now, perhaps, be easily overcome. As to the practical connecting of a bishopric with each very large town, local considerations must, of course, be taken into account. A question might arise, for instance, in reference to Bradford and Leeds; but if the scheme for a bishopric at Halifax were realised (and I am enough of a Yorkshireman to believe it would be realised), the question would be solved; for both Ripon and Leeds were in the West Riding. So, again, in the South, both Exeter and Plymouth belong to the same county; and we must not suppose that no result will come from those old plans for Cornwall which have hitherto been disappointed. Two cases which seemed to me to admit of no doubt are those of Birmingham and Newcastle. To turn to the district with which I am best acquainted, a residence of sixteen years in Liverpool and eight years in Chester has led me to think most seriously of the necessity of ecclesiastical reorganisation in that part of the world. The county of Chester is more than enough for any one Bishop. No Bishop of Chester could do more than nibble at that mass of half a million of people on the other side of the Mersey, with its noble features of enterprise and generosity on the one hand, and its dark shadows of vice and degradation on the other. Liverpool, too, could never possibly be subordinated in any sense to any other place. I am old enough to remember the time when the Church of England was relatively strong in Liverpool and relatively weak in Manchester. Now the case was exactly reversed, and chiefly because Manchester has a Bishop of its own. I wish to add, that any attempt to settle the matter in such a case by the appointment of a suffragan or coadjutor Bishop is absolutely out of the question. Turning now to Capitular institutions, I find their great defect is, that they are outside, so to speak, of the active life of the dioceses in which they are contained. Nor is this the case in England only. In one of the latest publications of the Abbé

Michaud, in the section where he pointed out how the power of the laity in France had been obliterated before that of the clergy, the power of the clergy before that of Bishops, and the power of the Bishops before that of the Pope, he remarked, that whereas formerly the Capitular bodies used to temper the episcopal authority, now they were altogether alien from and foreign to the diocesan government. Sometimes Bishops said they had done so and so, after "consulting their reverend brethren, the canons of the diocese;" but that was only a form. It seems to me that in case of the formation of a new diocese, as at St Alban's, a totally new kind of Chapter might be formed, consisting of parochial clergy specially appointed as members of a working diocesan council. I would say nothing about the Dean in such a case. The important thing was to get the Bishop. Nor would I say anything about the Cathedral. The man was more important than the building. All such thoughts I leave in the hands of the previous speaker. The *Record* had recently said that there was to be an "encounter" between Mr Beresford Hope and myself to-day; and I fear there must be some disappointment because the "encounter" has been so friendly, as, indeed, was only likely, since they had been associated together in the same volume of Essays which dealt with Cathedrals in their various aspects. Still these Congresses would be very dull if they revealed no differences of opinion. People did not come to these Congresses in such crowds and from distances so great in order that they might gaze on an unruffled surface of universal agreement. They came to see the meeting of the waters; and if some of the streams there were turbid, and rushed violently down from hills covered with mist, all this supplied fuller opportunities for useful reflection. To sum up what I have to say on the subject before us, I desire to see every large town in England with its own Bishop, identified with its characteristic interests, and all the Capitular institutions of the country organically connected with the active life of the dioceses to which they severally belong.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. Canon Tristram.

Mr Beresford Hope has said nearly all I wished to say, in the few admirable words he uttered upon making use of cathedral establishments for mission purposes. One of the statutes of the cathedral with which I have the honour of being connected appears to have foreseen the necessity and provided for it, for the canons of Durham are directed at such time as they are not in residence to go about the diocese preaching in the various churches, and especially in those parishes where there is cathedral property. That shows the intentions of the founders of our modern cathedrals that the members of the Capitular bodies should take not only a sympathising but an active part in diocesan work. It has struck me that in such a case as Durham, where we have about £2200 a year devoted to the maintenance of the minor canons, the churches in the diocese would profit better if, whilst we had the precentor and sacristan always resident, part of our funds should be spent (if we had power so to spend them) in the employment of young, vigorous, promising mission preachers, who might be of use in the diocese, and who, so soon as they had proved themselves, could be very suitably placed and provided for in the diocese. Our bishops are in great difficulties owing to the present condition of our cathedrals. So many of our canonries are attached to professorships, so many to archdeaconries; and whatever archidiaconal functions may be, they give full and important employment to their holders; and the number of canons unattached to other duties is at present very small. The Bishop of Carlisle has attached a canonry to the Inspectorship of Diocesan Schools. However, these are really minor matters of detail. The great point is, that all Churchmen ought thoroughly to feel that Chapters are intended

to be part of the working machinery of the diocese; and I do believe that all of us do our best to work in harmony, and turn our hands to the work which the necessities of the times have provided for us, but as to which we are very much crippled by the action of the Ecclesiastical Commission, although we ought to be thankful to them for the immense work they have done in our dioceses. It is, I think, much to be regretted that the power of the Bishop over the Capitular body is not greater, in order to ensure harmonious working.

Mr Dickinson.

I THINK the fact that we are discussing this subject at a Church Congress is a very good augury for the future. There are two points which seem to me to have been in some degree omitted by the preceding speakers. No one, I think, has talked sufficiently of the action of the whole Chapter in the election of a Bishop. It may be perhaps impossible at present to bring the whole city under the government of the Bishop. It may be impossible to have the endowments requisite for the Chapter to do their duty properly; but it seems to me that if you have a Bishop to each large town, and if you have men to do the work of the diocese and of the town, all the necessary institutions will follow in their proper course. There will be a means of gathering the clergy of the town more into a community than they are at present. There will be the possibility of making the clergy of the cathedral useful for various purposes, as the clergy of a cathedral ought to be. All this must be accomplished by careful legislation. Endowments and benefactions are freely given wherever a necessity for them is shown; and I believe the time is not far distant when we shall have a large increase of the Episcopate, and the institutions connected with it. Mention has been made of the lesser and the greater Chapters, following the rules of the cathedrals of the old foundation. It seems to me that one can hardly hope that the members of the lesser Chapter, who will have the care of schools and the education of young men for the ministry, and also of persons who will become schoolmasters, can be kept to their work without something beside episcopal supervision. I look, therefore, to the Diocesan Conference, and the action of the greater Chapter, as a guide and help to them. If you have a person specially endowed to take care of the cathedral seminary for the instruction of young men for holy orders, how can you secure the due performance of his work? You can only do it by closely connecting his duties and emoluments, by arranging that he shall hold his canonry so long as he does his work. Then, when he is stricken with paralysis, or otherwise incapacitated, he should be enabled to take the rest which is due to a man who has done his work well. By keeping a number of canonries free I believe the thing may be reasonably done, but I cannot see how you can secure that the retirement should take place at the proper time except there is a paramount diocesan authority working with the Bishop. With regard to the endowments, the funds in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have been hitherto closely confined to parochial purposes. I agree with Canon Tristram that much good has been done by that Commission, but I think the time has come when those purposes which Mr Beresford Hope has called the "staff" purposes of the Church should be attended to—when what remains of those funds should be applied to the different useful purposes of the Chapter. I mentioned just now the election of the Bishop by the Chapter. Possibly it might be better that it should be done by the Diocesan Conference. I certainly should be sorry if the new Bishops to be appointed were put in by the royal fiat. The shadows and forms of free election which remain are very valuable. The Church continued free for 150 years after Magna Charta; and when new Chapters and Bishoprics are formed, I hope we shall have the restoration of that freedom, in the election of a Bishop by the diocese.

The Chairman.

As I have at the present moment no more cards of gentlemen who wish to speak, perhaps I may be permitted to occupy a few minutes of your time. The administration of the cathedral in Manchester is regulated by a private Act called the Manchester Cathedral Act, and I do not suppose that unless it is specially mentioned, and its provisions reconsidered, it would be affected by any general measure upon the subject of cathedrals. I am in great hopes that it will be found necessary soon to apply to the legislature to alter some of the provisions of this Act. For example, I am made by the Act the rector of a parish containing about 11,000 people, 7000 of whom are Protestants. Each canonry is to be attached to a large church in the city, and two of these are already so attached, and these parishes each contain from 12,000 to 15,000 inhabitants. The consequence is, as far as we can see at present, that we may expect to have the canon very much impeded in his cathedral duties by his parochial duties, and the rector of the parish very much impeded in his parochial duties by his cathedral duties. Therefore it will injure both the canon and the rector to unite their offices. If it is necessary that canons of cathedrals should hold benefices, they ought to be small benefices, and not of such a size as to call for their almost exclusive attention. What Mr Beresford Hope has shadowed forth is, I think, the right thing, viz., the attaching of canonries to positions of diocesan importance, and I think that will eventually be the case. There seems to be a consensus of opinion now that the clergy of the cathedral church should be rather diocesan officers than mere holders of college offices, or being spoilt as diocesan officers, by having the charge of very large parishes. I am sure that that opinion is growing, and I think rightly growing. As to the Diocesan Conference, and its connection with the cathedral, I think that although we are very much tied up at Manchester by past traditions and parochial entanglements, yet we have been able to work with the Bishop cordially and thoroughly in this diocesan scheme, and I hope that next month there will be a Diocesan Conference of clergy and laity in the diocese of Manchester, and that it will be connected in its religious aspect with the cathedral, and that all the cathedral officers will have some part to take in it. We had last year a diocesan synod which was held in the cathedral. The Bishop summoned all the clergy of the diocese to meet him and hear his opinion on certain points. I think it would be a great thing if this diocesan synod should supersede the tedious operation called a Bishop's visitation. The oral communication between the Bishop and the clergy in the cathedral church, with an opportunity for a few of them, within a limited and specified time, to express their opinions, would be more profitable than the reading of a long charge (which I have known to last three hours under the dome of St Paul's), which is afterwards sent to us in a pamphlet form. The old idea of a Bishop's visitation seems to have passed away. As far as I can recollect, the old idea was that the Bishop should go round his diocese to meet his clergy at different points, look in upon their churches, and do all that which in the intervals between his visitations is done by the archdeacons, viz., seeing that the churches are properly cared for, that the churches' furniture is all that it should be, and that the general condition of our parishes is satisfactory. No one can say that the mere responding to one's name as it is called out by a secretary, and then listening to a Bishop's charge which next day each parish priest will receive in print, fulfils the proper idea of episcopal visitation. I hope our diocesan synod will enable the laity as well as the clergy to express their opinions to the Bishop on points relating to the welfare of the diocese. We shall try to do this in Manchester, and I hope that such conferences will become general. I am happy to hear Mr Beresford Hope say that they are becoming general. I was under the impression that it was only in a few dioceses that such conferences were held, but I am glad to find that I am wrong. It will be a blessed thing if any deliberations of Churchmen should hasten the good time when a cordial understanding between our bishops, the clergy, and the laity, is exhibited in a public way in the face of the whole nation.

Archdeacon Wright.

I cannot but consider that, valuable as are the many papers that have been read during the sitting of this Congress, there is no subject which has been discussed more important than that which occupies our attention here this morning. To the great body of clergy and laity gathered in the large manufacturing town of Stoke, it presents the work of the Congress in a very practical form; for placing a Bishop and Chapter in every thickly-populated town, is closely connected with evangelising the masses. We have towns such as Portsmouth, Halifax, Manchester, and Liverpool, and many others, with populations so large that out of every 100,000 we do not offer the means of grace to more than 30,000. I can speak with confidence on this point with regard to Portsmouth, which, with Gosport on the other side of the harbour, possesses 150,000 souls. It will be in vain for the Church of England to hope for the heart and confidence of the nation generally, unless something be done, and that speedily, to meet this terrible shortcoming; and my belief is, that giving to each large town a Bishop and Chapter might be made greatly to tend to such an end. I fully agree with the Very Rev. the Chairman, the Dean of Manchester, that to require, as in the cathedral body of that place, each canon to take charge of several thousand souls, is a serious mistake, for he cannot do the work of both canon (often with important literary occupation) and heavily tried parish priest. At the same time it will be perfect mockery to talk of a Bishop and capitular body for every large town, unless a strenuous endeavour be made by their means to grapple with the spiritual destitution immediately about them. But it will be asked, If each canon is not to be a parish priest, what is to be done? I answer, Let each town be divided into districts of, say, 4000 inhabitants. Let some twenty to thirty men and women be gathered together out of each district, and each pledged to provide £1 a quarter—a sum obtained with the greatest ease where Christ is faithfully set forth. That would produce £100 a year, and inasmuch as all the services in the district would be missionary, another £100 would be certain from the "Curates' Aid Society," the funds of which, when so employed, would increase enormously. Thus a clergyman would be provided. A canon of the cathedral might see to the carrying out the good work, by making it the object of his special care; and if necessary he might, on an emergency, even commence it himself. Thus the Bishop and his Chapter would be powerfully felt and valued. But if this or something like this be not done, it will be in vain to place them in our towns; for be assured of this, the people, as I have already said, will never admit that the Church is doing her work as she should do it, until she is found providing the means of grace for those thickly-populated spots which at present never see the face of a clergyman.

Rev. R. G. L. Blenkinsopp.

I have no hesitation whatever in saying that this is certainly one of the most important subjects that can be brought before a Church Congress, because it is a thoroughly practical one, and because so much of the Church's efficiency depends on the right working of cathedral institutions, which have never yet been able to carry out completely the objects for which they were instituted, for the simple reason that there have been in them more or less through successive generations the most flagrant examples of pluralities and non-residences. I have attended several Congresses in succession, and upon almost every subject I have heard discussed there have been differences of opinion, but upon the one subject of pluralities and non-residences I have never heard a single difference. All the speakers, without any exception, have condemned the system. There is, I believe, sufficient work in every diocese to occupy the

canons and all the clergy connected with the cathedral, without their being engaged in any parochial work whatsoever. The attachment of our people is certainly increasing towards our great cathedral institutions; and I hope that every cathedral church of a diocese will become, what it ought to be, the very centre of spiritual life, spiritual energy, and spiritual health, to the remotest corner of the diocese.

THE SUPPLY OF CLERGY, THROUGH THE "PROBATIONER" SYSTEM OR OTHERWISE.

PAPERS.

The Rev. G. H. Curteis, M.A., Canon of the Cathedral, and Principal of the Theological College, Lichfield.

It may be taken for granted, without further proof, that there is at present a great and growing need of additional clergy. It is a "great" need, because during this century the population has been trebled, while the numbers of the clergy have only been doubled. And it is also, I fear, a "growing" need, from several causes, which require from us a patient and careful scrutiny. I will only mention a few of these causes.

(1.) The first is one which is highly honourable to our Church. It is, *that she has cut out for herself, during the last thirty or forty years, an enormous increase of work.* Parishes have been subdivided, churches built, schools organised, missions set on foot, in all directions; and the consequence is, that an anxious doubt is beginning to be awakened as to *how all these great works are to be manned.* The Greek poet taught us at school that "naught is the tower, and naught the ship, devoid of men to keep watch and ward therein." And our military officers are said to be looking gravely on their great entrenchments at Dover, Portsmouth, Portland, and many other places; because they do not see the way to man them. Just so it is with our bishops. They are beginning to look gravely at their enormously extended lines of Church-work; because their ordination-lists show a growing inability to fill the vacant curacies.

It is to meet this serious peril that so many mixed theological colleges—colleges, that is, which combine together graduate and non-graduate students—have of late years been established. The earliest course adopted by the bishops naturally was to open the doors to "literates" pure and simple; and many admirable and earnest men entered the ministry that way. But it was soon found that the standard of requirement was being disastrously lowered. For what guarantee could a few hours' examination in Pearson and Paley afford, that the candidate possessed any fitness of character, or had passed through any education or mental discipline worthy of the name? It was therefore determined to supply colleges for training and discipline, where earnest men could work at Greek and other subjects, and could, after a year or two of preparation, meet fellow-students of a higher education, on the common ground of a practical training for the ministry. Under this system, no less than 308 men have

come under my own hands at Lichfield. And after sifting out 55 of these, there remain 253; of whom 83 (or about one-third) have been graduates. And I may say, from my own experience, that the influence of these two classes upon each other has been of great advantage to both. Of the 170 non-graduates, 86 came from the professional classes, 72 from the trading class, and 12 from the artisan or labouring class—no uncomely proportion of ingredients, I think, in which the clergy of a great national Church should represent to all orders of society the generous catholicity of her system.

Yet, even then, the ever-growing demand for more clergy remained unsupplied; while the increasing number of ordinations among his own kinsfolk and acquaintance was already firing the imagination of many a self-devoted and studious man, eagerly ambitious of taking service in the Church, but financially unable to maintain himself at college. Should such workers be discouraged because they were poor? That would be strangely to forget the first principles of Churchmanship. Or should the mischiefs of the old Literate system be hazarded once more? That were surely impossible, with all its evils still fresh in episcopal memory.

In this dilemma, a certain bishop, not far off—whom we have all heard slyly called "a first-rate general or admiral spoiled"—was not found wanting to the occasion. He invented a scheme—something like the Oxford and Cambridge local examinations—whereby a dozen good objects were secured at one blow. In the first place, his own cathedral chapter was induced to take a lively interest in the matter, and to appoint an Examining Board, which should meet twice a year to sift and test the "probationers" who should present themselves. Next, this examining body has put forth a list of subjects for study in four successive groups, carrying the student through a course of two years' prescribed reading, and taking each set of books for examination in its turn. And lastly, the parochial clergy themselves have been turned, before they were aware, into the most able and efficient recruiting-sergeants all over the country. So that, if the other dioceses do not mind what they are about, we shall (before many years are past) have all the most promising young men throughout England and Wales transmitted, by this new "underground railroad," for service in the diocese of Lichfield.

Suppose, for instance, a young man at Newark or Coventry or Chester displays—as member of the choir, Sunday-school teacher, district-visitor, or in any other capacity—some remarkable gifts or tastes suiting him for clerical life, the clergyman of the parish would naturally talk to such a man, would encourage him, inquire about his studies, test his abilities and his knowledge. If all these were satisfactory, his next step might be to write to Lichfield, recommending the young man as well worthy of probation. And if he would only undertake three things—to direct his friend in study, to employ him in parish work, and to certify half-yearly his diligence and good conduct—the recommendation would certainly be accepted. The candidate would then be furnished with his two years' list of subjects. And at the end of the two years, if each stage had been passed without misadventure, he would be admitted for one year's final training in the Theological College. It should also be added that the whole surplus-earnings of the college are devoted, every year, to exhibi-

tions (£30) for poor and deserving men; and that two of these, at least, are held in reserve for "probationers."

Such is what we call at Lichfield "the probation system." And as we have no desire whatever to keep its advantages to ourselves, we wish to submit to this Congress the question, whether some such scheme be not demanded by the urgent necessities of our time; whether we may not, by such a plan, draw gradually under training for the ministry a large number of earnest and able men, whose services would otherwise be lost; whether the clergy, far and wide, up and down the country, would not thereby become deeply interested in recruiting their own order; whether the central influences of the cathedral, with its staff of highly-educated and experienced dignitaries, might not thus be made to vibrate in a hundred bank-parlours, counting-houses, schoolrooms, and even workshops, throughout the land; and above all, whether the true ideal of the Christian ministry—as it was instituted by the Lord Himself—would not by this means be strikingly set forth, each class of society being allowed to offer its sons for His service, each, therefore, (amid all the separations and conflicting interests of modern life) finding in the Church a common point of interest and a common field of labour, and each becoming softened and Christianised thereby, and so better guaranteed against wild schemes of social revolution. For the only true socialism is to be found in the Church of Jesus Christ. And whenever its wonderful beauty shall dawn on men, and they shall strive in earnest to realise it, then, instead of heated labourers' meetings and insane clamour against Church-endowments (the only form of property now remaining in which all classes have a perfectly common interest), we shall perhaps have that peaceful scene repeated, so sweetly painted for us by Chaucer—

> "A good man ther was of Religioun,
> That was a poure persone of a toun:
> But rich he was of holy thought and werk;
> He was also a lerned man, a clerk.
> . . . . . .
> "With him ther was a plowman, was his brother,
> That had ylaid of dong ful many a fother.
> A trewe swinker, and a good, was he!—
> Living in pees and parfite charitee."

(2.) I pass on to a second cause which has been operating, of late years, to diminish the usual supply of clergy from the upper and middle classes. It is to be found in *the modern vast extension of commerce, and the many roads that trade and manufactures have opened to the easy acquisition of wealth.* Of course, this only operates to the detriment of the Church in one way—viz., in deterring parents and guardians from "destining their sons" (as it is called) for holy orders. This disadvantage may, however, be easily converted into a positive blessing. It may be made a sieve, whereby those who would fain serve the Church as hirelings, may be prevented from serving her at all. But beyond that—when it is seen that the highest in the land do not disdain to enter into trade, and so to meet on common ground the worldly of all classes who seek there an avenue to riches and power—is it too much to hope that the un-worldly and self-denying of all classes may find in the ministry of the Church a common ground on which they can, without distinction, unite? The example has

been set by the world. Cannot the Church, under far higher and more constraining motives, follow it? If not, she deserves to fall. God forbid that she should stand, if her ministry can only be recruited by "prizes" and bribes! God forbid that the Church should again surrender to a Plutocracy, as she did in the thirteenth century, when a Bishop of Worcester dared to protest at a synod in St Paul's: "Since many noblemen that have such blood as mine running in their veins, hold pluralities, and have lived magnificently, it would be too hard to reduce them to a disgraceful poverty by deprivation; some of them, too, are young and bold, and would run the last risk rather than be confined to one benefice." Better deprivation (say we, now-a-days) than depravation; and as to blood—there is a passage in Holy Writ which declares that God "hath made *of one blood* all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth."

(3.) But there is a third cause, which is probably more effectual in deterring the higher ranks in society from seeking commissions in the Church, than the one which we have just dismissed. *It is the fear of a coming disestablishment.* Now this fear I believe to be a mere spectre, conjured up by men's own morbid fancies, and then converted into a really formidable power for evil. No doubt Mr Mistrust and Mr Timorous, and certain other gentlemen, who are very much the reverse of timorous indeed, have raised a great outcry, and have declared there was this terrible lion in our path. We need not believe them. And even if the report were true, lions can be overcome and cowed by bravery. And the brave and sovereign remedy against all such fancies as these, is plain: it is to crystallise within the mass of the Church herself so effective and striking an organisation that, come what may from without, a graduated and dignified *order* may never be wanting within. For it is, I suppose, "disorder" that all refined and educated natures hate. It is not liberty, England's own special offspring: it is not the equality of all, before the law and before God: it is not the essential brotherhood of all—a thing taught by the gospel itself—that aristocratic Englishmen hate. No, it is only chaos that they hate. It is revolution, wherein all things and persons that should be at the bottom come to the top, and all that should be at the top go to the bottom—this is what we *all* hate, and what our Church hates too. And if the fear of this were put an end to by the creation of an organisation, stronger and completer than we have at present, the sting of disestablishment would be taken away. Why should not, for instance, a separate and self-supporting diaconate be created? Why should not rural deans be raised to higher dignity and power, the cathedrals be awakened to a sense of their high diocesan functions, synods and conferences be made more truly representative and efficient, and dioceses be subdivided until the "Bishop in Chapter" (rather than the Bishop in Parliament) became a real power, flashing life and encouragement into every corner of the area assigned to his charge? Surely, then, the spiritual beauty and glory and energy of the ecclesiastical order would outshine, in men's estimation, the mere secular attractiveness of high position and sounding titles, and the word "disestablishment" would cease to exert any baneful influence whatever on the supply of clergy from the upper classes in England.

(4.) A fourth cause which, it must be feared, has (of late) somewhat

diminished the natural supply of clergy from the educated classes, is *the confusion and uncertainty which have prevailed as to the Church's law.* Sanguine people probably hoped that—Convocation having been empowered to facilitate matters, and then a new Court of Final Appeal having been promised—two or three friendly suits would, long before this time, have cleared away our most pressing difficulties. Such expectations, however, have not been realised. And so long as the present mischievous confusion lasts, so long no one can wonder at men of refinement withholding their services from a Church which does not seem to know her own mind. But the remedy is in our own hands. If English Churchmen would only come to a firm determination, first of all, to demand plain justice, and after that to practise a plain obedience, this cause, at least, for a scanty and shrivelling supply of the best men for holy orders would vanish as rapidly as it has arisen.

(5.) The last cause which I shall mention as, at present, abating the supply of clergy, especially from the Universities, is by far the most serious of all. It is *a growing uneasiness about the truth of the popular and traditional presentations of Christianity, and a (fancied) widening divergence between "Reason" and "Faith."* I venture to think that there is no *real* discrepancy between the two, and also that it would not be difficult to make that fact clearly intelligible to Englishmen. But that it *may* be thus made clear, it is of the very first importance that we should not banish from our pulpits just that class of intelligent men who could best mediate between the old views and the new. Now, these men will not take office in the Church, if they are to be too much harassed in the discharge of a very difficult and exhausting duty. Archdeacon Reichel has told us this morning that during the last seven years not one Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, has taken holy orders. It is true, the creeds and standards of the Church form a code of general directions from which no loyal man will depart. But beyond that the utmost liberty of preaching should be allowed; and if the sermons in our churches could be disentangled from matins and evensong (with which they have no very natural connection), and could be given—as they are now at the Universities—in conjunction merely with a bidding-prayer or some short litany, a much greater liberty of *hearing*, as well as of preaching, would be introduced. And then if the primitive order of deacons, or of readers, were revived, holding the bishop's licence to preach when required, there is little doubt both that the pulpit would soon become a far greater power than it is at present, and also that the Church would attract into her official ranks many an able man who is now *censorious* because he has never tried to preach, and *sceptical* because he has never put to a crucial test how much more wise and reasonable are the "old paths" of the Church than are his own crude and unverified speculations. A certain uniformity and routine in our standing lections from Holy Scripture is most desirable: we then sit still, and God, in His tranquil majesty, speaks to us. A certain prescribed uniformity in that glorious thing, the united offering up of divine worship, is also desirable: it is there that the *Church* teaches and drills us, leaving to her children the most generous liberty of choice and of interpretation. But a dreary uniformity in the pulpit were death itself; for there the *individual* teaches, and he is bound to throw into his work all the forces of per-

sonal conviction, and all the wealth of illustration and argument he has at his command.

That such an unequalled opportunity for influencing the mind and habits of the nation, as the ministry of our Church affords, will long continue to be overlooked by men of high refinement and education, it is quite impossible to believe. It is quite true that other classes besides theirs deserve a place, and are now certain to hold a place, among the ranks of the English clergy; for it is not one class, but all classes of society, that ought to contribute the best of their sons to this great offertory presented at God's altar. But without that class, which forms the cutting-edge to all the rest, no permanent leadership of any modern nation's thought can possibly be maintained. And it is as true of classes as it is of individuals, that "there are diversities of gifts and differences of administrations; but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will."

The Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, M.A., Rector of St Aldate's, Oxford.

1. In all our difficulties with regard to "The Supply of Clergy," we have the great encouragement that our Lord Jesus Christ, who is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," is still moved with compassion as He sees the multitudes who are "as sheep having no shepherd."

He has taught His Church, once for all, an infallible way of obtaining a supply of faithful pastors in the words—"The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth labourers into His harvest."

According to our faith in obeying this command will be the number and the spiritual character of the supply of clergy given. The first thing the clergy have to do in seeking a larger supply of fellow-labourers is not only to pray in full trust and hope perseveringly themselves, but to stir up all their believing people to pray with undoubting faith, in that Name which is above every name, to the Lord of the harvest to thrust forth labourers into His harvest. Let each member of the Church ask himself faithfully the question, "Have I really made this a matter of frequent intercession in my private and in my family prayers?"

2. Real prayers are sure to be followed by real efforts to promote in some way or other the supply of clergy. It is a true saying, "Prayers and pains, through faith in Christ Jesus, can do anything which it is God's will that we should accomplish."

A good example is an encouraging thing. I will therefore give one. Canon Bardsley of Manchester has, during the last eighteen years, been made instrumental in promoting the training and the ordination in our Church of no less than *twenty-seven* young men out of his own congregation. Fourteen of these have received a university education; the remaining thirteen have passed through one or other of the colleges of divinity. Four have devoted themselves to missionary work amongst the heathen in connection with the Church Missionary Society. Besides

sending six of his own sons to Oxford and a seventh to a college of divinity, all of whom were ordained in our Church, Canon Bardsley made himself responsible for the college expenses of ten other young men. He is deeply grateful to the Christian friends in Manchester and elsewhere who so readily relieved him of the burden.

Let the clergy find out really pious, devoted, able men, with their hearts set upon Christ and His work, and the large-hearted Christian laymen who know and trust those clergy will supply the means to train these young men.

It is a suggestive fact in connection with this supply of twenty-seven valuable clergy from one congregation, that it was in the Sunday and ragged schools connected with Canon Bardsley's church, that in nearly every case the aptness to teach was displayed which marked out these young men for the ministry of the gospel.

Perhaps some brother here thinks that he is *too old* to begin such a work as Canon Bardsley's; but Pastor Gossner of Berlin was sixty-five years of age when he began to train young men to be missionaries. When younger he had never thought that he could do anything in this way. Yet before he died, at the age of eighty-five, he had trained and sent out to heathen lands more than a hundred missionaries.

On the other hand, perhaps some brother thinks that he is *too young* to follow Canon Bardsley's example. Yet a friend of mine, when he was a very young curate in Oxford, formed a Greek Testament class of eight young Christian townsmen, tried and trusted as Sunday-school teachers. He had no thought whatever of asking any member of this class to offer himself for the ministry. He began the class that the young men in it might understand the New Testament better, and be made more useful to others. But the result has been that three members of that class have been nearly three years under training at the Church Missionary College in London for work amongst the heathen, and are giving the greatest satisfaction to the Principal. Three other members of the class, excellent men, will shortly be ordained for the home ministry after due training at a college. Why should not hundreds of other curates do quite as much by means of a Greek Testament class as was done at Oxford by the Rev. J. H. Goodier, now Vicar of St Jude's, Hunslet, Leeds, when he was curate of St Peter le Bailey, Oxford?

The Rev. W. H. Barlow, now the Principal of the Church Missionary College, London, when he was full of work as the incumbent of a church in Bristol, kindly trained ten young men for the ministry. One of these came out first man at the Bishop of London's ordination examination, without any other teaching than that which he received from Mr Barlow. How much might incumbents do of this kind of work, if they realised more fully the Church's urgent need of a larger supply of clergy!

3. Nothing will more powerfully move us to obey our Lord's command to pray to the Lord of the harvest, than the consideration of our own impotence to raise up *the kind of curates we need*. Incumbents and their parishes need curates who will *work*—who will work for the Lord Jesus with faith, and love, and energy, and self-denial, as those who love Him with all their hearts, and who therefore love souls for His sake; who will work on patiently in poor and populous parishes, faithfully, wisely, zealously, humbly, in a truly Scriptural manner; who will *determine to know*

nothing amongst our people save Jesus Christ and Him crucified; who will preach Christ in all the glory of His Divine Person, and in all the perfect, the immediate, the eternal efficacy of His atoning work; who will *beseech* sinners, as though God did beseech men by them, to be reconciled at once to God by faith in Christ's blood: who will say plainly and boldly to our people, "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things." We need curates who will preach Christ as a Saviour who not only saves all who trust in Him from the wrath to come, but also *saves them now* from the dominion, the love, and the practice of sin: a Saviour who "gave Himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify unto Himself a peculiar people zealous of good works."

A faithful curate is a most precious gift of God to a parish. His stipend is money which goes further in doing the Lord's work, than if it were spent in any other way whatever. But there can be no greater hindrance to the work of Christ in a parish than an unspiritual and worldly-minded curate; except, of course, an unspiritual and worldly-minded rector.

As we think of the spiritual qualifications we need in our future clergy, let us honour God before the Church and the world, by saying, "We know not what to do effectively to obtain an adequate supply of faithful clergy, but *our eyes are upon Thee.*"

4. Why should we not ask and receive faith unitedly to supplicate "the Father of mercies" to pour out His Holy Spirit upon our colleges and schools, upon the heads and tutors of our colleges, and upon the head masters and assistant masters of our public and other schools, that these honoured men may bear ever on their hearts their Church's great need of a larger supply of faithful clergy, and may pray and strive, in faith and love and hope, to lead to Christ, for the work of the gospel, the hearts of those whom God has placed under their influence? Let us pray that God's rich blessing may rest upon all their efforts to establish their scholars in the faith and in the infallible proofs of the truth of the gospel, so that they may be fortified against the sceptical tendencies of the day.

Is not our Church's need so great, is not the *only* way to obtain a supply of faithful and really efficient labourers so obvious, that we may well entreat our bishops to call the whole Church to special prayer for this definite object of a "supply of clergy," at least during the interval between Ascension Day and Whitsunday?

It may be that in answer to the prayer of faith, the Lord of the harvest, besides sending us more candidates for holy orders who need a stipend for their maintenance, will raise up not a few devoted young men of good education and ample private means, eager to serve the Lord that bought them in the largest, the poorest, the most degraded parishes in our beloved country, without being chargeable to any man; men who would regard the work of the ministry of the gospel as the most blessed work to which any young man can be called in this one short life in which he has to walk by faith and not by sight; men who seek not earthly promotion, but believe the promises, "They that turn many to righteousness (shall shine) as the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. xii. 3).

and "he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins."

If the Holy Spirit were to be poured out upon our young educated Christian men, the Lord Jesus would be the Friend whom each would *first* consult in choosing his work for life. He would say to Him, "Lord, what wilt THOU have me to do?" It may be that many would recognise His providential call in *the urgent need* which so many thousands of their fellow-countrymen have of a larger supply of faithful clergy. For one look at their own acknowledged weakness, these young men will take ten looks at the heart of the Lord Jesus, and at the riches of His grace, placed within the reach of the hand of faith, and sufficient for all their need.

5. After all, the great reason of the too scanty supply of clergy for real missionary work at home and abroad is, that many of our Christian young men are wanting in *two* things. These are the very things which we elders also most need, and nothing will unite our hearts more to-day than the deep feeling and the humble acknowledgment of our common need, and our loving trust in the Lord Jesus to supply that need. If we elders had these two things in a higher degree, God would make us to be much more efficient in promoting the supply of clergy.

These two things which our Christian young men most need are, *first*, entire unreserved devotion of themselves to the Lord Jesus to do His will and His work, at any cost, in any position, in any parish, in any climate, to which He may draw them by showing them the spiritual destitution of sinners for whom He died. The *second* thing needed is, the means to the above end, namely, simple, thorough, unhesitating faith in the Lord Jesus Christ for grace sufficient to enable them to do any work to which He may call them; and grace sufficient to enable them to yield to Him that entire devotion of themselves to His service which He requires of His redeemed people. We must have a greater number of young *laymen* entirely consecrated to the Lord for His work, before we shall have a sufficient supply of clergy.

The Queen has a large army of brave soldiers ready to go anywhere, and to do anything, or at least to *try* to do anything, which she, by her Government, commands them to do.

Where is the young officer who would be unwilling to go, at the Queen's command, to do any service, however dangerous, in India, China, or Africa? But the Lord Jesus has no such loyal, self-sacrificing *army*, as our Queen commands. The Lord Jesus has a few isolated, devoted missionaries whom their young Christian brethren at home coldly leave, in the midst of the Lord's enemies, to fight and die exhausted *almost alone*. The *only* young men who are afraid of the climate of India are those who are asked to go out as missionaries! Young men were eager to go to the bloody trenches before Sebastopol, or to encounter the dangers of war and climate at the siege of Delhi, or at the Relief of Lucknow, or those of a long march through a deadly African forest to the country of the Ashantees. But how very few are ready to go to a nobler warfare in heathen lands which God's providence has opened for spiritual conquests, for Him who said, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"—a warfare of faith and love for the rescue by the gospel of those fellow-subjects in India lying blind and in darkness and under the power of

Satan! The Lord's last command is neglected. His promises are distrusted. Self is regarded. An easier course is preferred.

The very same want of entire devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ, and of faith in Him for sufficient grace to qualify them for the work to which He calls His servants—the very same want which keeps back young men from offering themselves for missionary work amongst the heathen, keeps them back from offering themselves for self-denying, difficult work in our poor and populous parishes. Many Christian young men do not seem able to trust their God to supply all their need, both their spiritual and their temporal need, "according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus."

6. If the love of God be shed abroad in the hearts of the rich members of our Church, by the Holy Ghost given to them, they will feel it to be one of the sweetest pleasures their riches can give them, to send cheques to some of the excellent Clerical Education Societies, for educating pious and able young men for the ministry, who could not without this aid go to a university or to a theological college. For example, to the one of which the Rev. Edward Auriol, of 35 Mecklenburgh Square, London, Rector of St Dunstan's, Fleet Street, is the Honorary Secretary.

Such large-hearted Christians will not be content with bewailing the spread of scepticism, but will prove the reality of their own faith by such good works as these.

When, through the power of the Holy Ghost working in their hearts, the love of Christ becomes the ruling passion with rich Christians, some of them will found clerical scholarships for unattached students at Oxford or Cambridge; or exhibitions at our colleges of divinity; so that pious and able young men of small resources, who desire to devote their lives to the ministry of the gospel in our Church, may be enabled to obtain the training they need.

I have the best possible means of knowing with certainty that £60 a year will pay the board, lodging, and tuition of an unattached student at Oxford or Cambridge, or of a student at a college of divinity. Of course, the student must be one who, from conscientious motives, practises a rigid economy with firm resolution.

There are many pious and able young men, the sons of widows and others, who have no resources to carry them through the university, and yet are quite as much gentlemen in birth, education, mind, and manners, as richer young men. Such men are lost to the ministry of our Church for want of so small a sum as £200 to pay the expenses of a three years' course at a university, or at a college of divinity, and of another £100 to pay their vacation and other expenses during their three years' training.

7. That the supply of clergy may be well qualified to meet the sceptical tendencies of the day, I would earnestly recommend candidates for holy orders, after taking their B. A. degree, to place themselves for a year under some sound divine who has made these subjects his special study. For example, under such a one as Dr Boultbee, Principal of St John's Hall, Highbury, or the Rev. Saumarez Smith, Principal of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

Would it not be well also for the universities or for the archbishops to establish an annual "*Christian Evidences Tripos*," in which all young clergymen possessed of some mental energy who have not passed more

than three years since they were ordained deacons may seek to obtain a class? Might not the bishops encourage the study of the Evidences of Christianity by making a high place in this Tripos one among other things to guide them in their making choice of young clergymen to fill vacant incumbencies in towns? This Tripos would open to young clergymen who have not a university degree an opportunity of obtaining a distinction more directly expressive of qualification for the ministry of the gospel.

8. As one who has known hundreds of undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge during the last sixteen years, and who never knew so many true-hearted Christian young men anywhere else, I have reason to value most highly university men. I am altogether opposed to the adoption of a faint-hearted, desponding tone with respect to our universities, as if these great seats of learning and nurseries of the clergy were to be abandoned to unbelievers. The dark side may be very dark, but there is also a bright side.

I believe that there never were more young men desiring to serve Christ at our universities than there are now. But I think that we must take heed that "the supply of clergy" is not discouraged by an unfair and undistinguishing prejudice against the very valuable class of clergy who have not taken a degree at a university.

It would do something to remove this prejudice to ascertain how many clergymen without a university degree, during the last ten years, have read the gospel when ordained deacons, because they passed the best examination before the bishop and his chaplains, and so far proved themselves to be better qualified for holy orders than any of the university men ordained with them. I leave it to others to speak of the distinctions obtained by other theological colleges. For the sake of definiteness and accuracy, I will take a single college as an example, and will speak of the results obtained by Dr Boultbee and his assistant tutors at St John's Hall, Highbury. From this college, designated "The London College of Divinity," 131 students have been ordained during the last ten years. Of these no less than *twenty* have been placed first at the bishop's examination, and have therefore read the gospel at the ordination. That is, two out of every thirteen of those men trained at this college. Only one of these twenty was a graduate of a university. Thus, at nineteen ordinations within ten years, a student from one small college of divinity passed a better examination before the bishop and his chaplains than any of the university men ordained with them. I doubt not that many trained at other theological colleges, without having been at a university, have also read the gospel when ordained deacons.

But this is not all which non-university men have done. "*The Preliminary Examination of Candidates for Holy Orders*," held twice a year at Cambridge, "is conducted under the direction of the Divinity professors and members of the theological faculty, in co-operation with many of the bishops. It has been established with a view to aid in promoting a more systematic and better distributed course of preparation for holy orders." There were thirteen men in the *First* Class after this examination last October. Four of these were trained at St John's Hall, Highbury; and only three of the thirteen are university men. There were thirty-seven in the *Second* Class. Of these seven were trained at St John's Hall, and seventeen at

universities. Thus, these seventeen university men in the Second Class were surpassed in this university examination, conducted by three Oxford and three Cambridge examiners, by no less than *ten* men who were never members of a university, who, with only three university men, made up the First Class of thirteen. Last April the First Class at the Cambridge "Preliminary Examination" contained seven men—two from St Aidan's, Birkenhead, one from St Bees, one not a member of any college, and three university men. Thus, in this examination, four students who were never at a university passed a better examination than no less than twenty-seven university men in the Second Class. Surely after such results of examinations conducted by learned university men, it is time for less learned university men to give up disparaging brother clergymen who have not taken a university degree. English fairness, common sense, good manners, and Christian brotherly love, all combine with the results of these theological examinations to condemn any uncourteous and undistinguishing disparagement of really valuable non-university men. The clergyman who knows Christ and His gospel and the Word of God best, and who preaches Christ most faithfully, and who, in the power of the Holy Ghost, lives most by faith in Christ, and is most fully consecrated to His service, is the best clergyman, whether trained at a university, or at a college of divinity.

9. It is a very important consideration how far it is possible *now* to abide by the instructions given to Timothy and Titus. *They* were directed by the Holy Ghost, through the apostle, to choose out *seasoned* Christians, family men, known and trusted. *We* send very young men to college, and press all the Latin and Greek we can into them by means of the very necessary stimulus of examinations, during a three years' university course, and we expect them to become well qualified "elders" at the age of twenty-four. I only state the contrast, let it be well considered.

When the Church is starving for want of curates, and thousands of souls are therefore neglected for whom Christ died, might it not be well for our bishops to make their rule a little more elastic, and to ordain pious and able men of experience and energy, who have proved themselves to be fit for ministerial work by their Christian labours as laymen?

It was usually men of this kind rather than young men fresh from the schools of Athens and Alexandria that were ordained "elders" in every city by apostolical missionaries. It may be that the sooner we follow the example of the fathers in this matter the better. We cannot afford to give up the present system of ordaining very young men, but may not the apostolical method be used also in very special cases?

Let me give an example of a useful clergyman who began life in a very different calling. Twenty-nine years ago Mr Squire, who had been a lieutenant in the Royal Navy, was appointed vicar of Swansea. He found that great town destitute of any Church week-day school, and destitute of any Church Sunday-school. But since then in the schools which he has built, 28,000 children have been educated, who have paid £12,700 in school pence. And the amount he has raised for the building of additional churches and schools, and for other local objects, and for home and foreign missions, has reached nearly £100,000.

The Principal of one of our most successful theological colleges, who was himself in the first class of the classical Tripos, and a Fellow of Trinity

College, Cambridge, and therefore naturally is strongly predisposed to set a high value upon classical studies as a means of culture, wrote to me thus a few days ago: "The question, whether linguistic acquirements (Latin and Greek) for candidates for holy orders should be enforced, as a *sine qua non* in *every* case, is a question which ought to be faced, and wisely and patiently considered. I believe that, in many cases, the time devoted to Latin and Greek would be better spent in *English;* and that *Bible knowledge* ought to be more insisted on and cared for in *all* cases."

There is nothing at the present time more satisfactory in all our theological examinations, both in those at the universities and in those before the bishops, than the undoubted fact that a knowledge of the Bible is, in all of them, made the principal and most indispensable subject.

To conclude. Our great want in seeking to promote the supply of clergy, as in all other departments of the Lord's work, is more faith in our God and in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord. By faith we abide in Christ, and He said, "He that abideth in Me, and I in Him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without ME ye can do nothing" (John xv. 5). Success in leading young men to devote themselves to the service of God in the ministry of the gospel comes like "the fruits of righteousness," only "by Jesus Christ," according to our faith in Him. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." I close with a portion of that Word which may encourage us in seeking to increase "the supply of clergy;" and may, through the Spirit, call some young laymen to seek the ministry of the gospel. "The same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him. For whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe on Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things" (Romans x. 12-15).

DISCUSSION.

Rev. W. Reyner Cosens, D.D., Vicar of Dudley, Worcestershire.

For many years I have been engaged in the endeavour to increase the supply of clergy, and my present position as vicar of a parish of 15,000 people forces me to the sad conclusion, that one of the weakest points in our Church is the supply of its clergy. If the words of the Bishop of Carlisle this morning be true (and no doubt they were carefully written and pondered by him), that many of the clergy had not the slightest notion of what they had to do when they went into their parishes, then this subject is the most important of all those which are upon the paper. I will ask two questions, and endeavour, very briefly, to answer them. First, what is the best system of giving to young men the opportunity of becoming probationers? I do not think that the mere sending of a young man to a theological college, which probably is situated in a village, is in any way the probation which is required for preparing a man for work in such parts of the country as that in which my own lot is cast. I am of opinion

that we need men who will come and reside with us in our parishes for, say a year, before they are ordained, and in the course of that year they should be thoroughly instructed in the different branches of the work which they will have to do afterwards. From five years' experience in a large parish in the Black Country, I am of opinion that it is impossible for a vicar to be continually educating junior curates. We lose a large amount of the force which we might throw into our parishes, from the fact that again and again a man comes to us, remains for about two years, and then leaves us. We ought to have men of more experience when they come to us, and therefore I think that one of the best things to be done in the way of probation is to take care that men shall learn the exact character of the people amongst whom they will have to work as curates, and who will therefore know how to deal with them when they go forth as pastors. The second question is one which has a very important bearing—How are the sons of the clergy to be educated in the future? If it be true (and I speak as the father of many sons) that the sizarships and exhibitions which were originally founded for the benefit of the sons of the clergy are now thrown open to competition, and carried off by the sons of rich men and well-to-do tradesmen, what are our clergy to do with their narrow incomes? No men ought to be more fitted for the ministry of the Church than the sons of the clergy. I would introduce to the notice of this Congress a fund which is yet only in its infancy — the Ordination Exhibition Fund—as to which information can be obtained from Mr Ingram, of 7 Whitehall. It is a fund which provides needy young men with the means of obtaining some education for the ministry; and although, as I have told you, it is a young society, it is none the less a most useful means of assisting in the most important work of increasing the supply of fit men for the work.

Rev. W. Harding Girdlestone, D.D., Hon. Canon of the Cathedral, and Principal of the Theological College, Gloucester.

The first difficulty in providing a requisite number of young men for the ministry is the financial one; and, with all deference to those speakers who have spoken on the probationer system, I do not think it fully meets the difficulty. It only results, as it seems to me, in substituting a bad or inferior training in a country parish for two years in place of a year's good training at a college. As to this financial difficulty, we might take a good lesson from the practice of Nonconformist bodies. "*Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*" While they train, they at the same time support, their candidates for the ministry at their colleges; they have no competitive examination for scholarships, but deserving poverty is that which causes these young men to be selected, sent up to college, and supported there. That is an important element. The training we can give at the theological colleges is only short at the best; but even so, the financial difficulty stares us in the face. Let the laity recognise this, and meet the difficulty, either by patronising this Ordination Fund; or let congregations select deserving men, and send them to our colleges and support them there; then the Principals would be paid by results, and the young men would be helped and encouraged. I have application after application always commencing in this way—"Will you kindly tell me the expenses at your college—how much, or how little, it will cost a man to get through?" A second detriment from which these colleges suffer is that the bishops, as a rule, with the exception of the bishop in whose particular diocese the college may be situated, look

coldly upon the men who are trained in them, whilst they receive any graduate, however ignorant of theology. In illustration of this let me tell you a story, which I know to be true, and which is not six months old: A young man who had taken his degree at one of the universities was speaking to one of the students of my college at Gloucester, asking him questions about the sort of work done there, and so on. At last he said, "You have spoken over and over again of the Thirty-nine Articles; what are they?" And yet within a month's time the university man was ordained, whereas I believe the student of the theological college would have had difficulty in obtaining holy orders from the bishop. I think it is only fair that persons should know the discouragements under which we labour who devote our best energies to training men for the service of the Church.

Rev. Samuel Andrew.

Some years ago I had the honour to propose and forward to the Bishop of Lichfield a resolution from four united deaneries in the Peak of Derbyshire, praying for the establishment of what is known as the probationer system in this diocese. The bishop received the resolution with great joy, and proceeded at once to establish the system which we have now at work. I desire, as a clergyman in a large parish, to detail the steps taken in the introduction of a candidate for holy orders under this system. I ought perhaps to remark at once, that it does not in the least preclude the going to the university or a theological college after the probation is over, but it naturally leads on to that. It is most important that the parochial minister should be careful in the choice of the right man. He should get all the recommendations possible, and then have a personal interview. After that he would do well to have his candidate for a month with him, in his own house, as a probationer, in order to form an opinion as to whether he will be likely to suit the parish, and what state he is in with regard to learning and character. When the month is over it will be necessary for him to make up his mind as to the means of his maintenance. I have given £50, £60, and in one instance £70 a year. In two of these cases they proceeded to holy orders, and they are now labouring with success in this diocese. In the next place, it is necessary for a clergyman to be very careful as to the way of introducing candidates to their work. He must be careful how he introduces them into his school; they may do mischief instead of good, they may do a great deal of good, as I have seen. He must be very careful also about introducing them into the solemn matter of preaching in cottages and schoolrooms, or weekly lectures in the church, and he must be still more careful in introducing them into the work of parochial visiting; otherwise they may do more harm than good. At every step he must be careful what he is about. Then there are many difficulties connected with training them I mean, overlooking their studies and preparing them for the college. In this diocese, after a candidate has been with a clergyman for some time, he goes to Lichfield to the "Probationers' Theological Examination," and the clergyman who sends a candidate always receives a detailed report of the manner in which he has acquitted himself at his preliminary examination, and the clergyman would do well to be guided very much by that report.* I recommend a long probation for candidates-

* The probationers' examinations are held in the bishop's palace twice every year, near the time of the Lent and September examination for holy orders. The probationers' examination board consists of the bishop and assistant bishops, the dean and canons of the cathedral, the principal of the theological college, and the diocesan inspectors of schools. One-half only of the usual term at the theological college is required for holy orders from successful probationers, thus reducing the expense. Probationers are also eligible for exhibitions at the college.

two or three years, and then I would have them go to a theological college. The longer you keep them under supervision, the more thoroughly you can initiate them into their work, the more likely you are to have trustworthy and valuable results.

The Ven. Archd. Ffoulkes.

If we would wish to succeed in inducing a larger number of men to seek holy orders, we must appeal to them at an earlier age than we generally do. I would strongly advise that we should appeal to boys at the time of their confirmation, for two reasons; first, because at that age they are generally thinking about choosing their future profession, and next, because they have been under special religious teaching at the time, and may more readily be inclined for God's service. There are many boys who would at that age be very willing to prepare themselves for holy orders if they thought it possible that their parents could find the means to educate them for the ministry; and if we consider further how schools are improving the quality of the education they give, and how, in consequence, the time necessary to be spent at a university is shortening itself, I think it would be wise to offer to ordain men as deacons at the age of twenty-one instead of twenty-three, which, I believe, our bishops could do if the archbishops would give the necessary dispensing power.* I know by experience that a number of boys at the age of fifteen have a strong desire to study for holy orders, but give up the idea as hopeless. Their parents say, "We cannot maintain you at school and college till you are twenty-three." Therefore I think it might be a wise experiment that deacons might be ordained at twenty-one for curacies where they should not be called upon to preach, and that they should obtain their licence to preach, after due probation, at a subsequent examination. They might assist the priest in various ways, such as cottage lectures, and in the schools, and visitation of the parish. At the end of a year they might go before the bishop to be examined as to their preaching powers, and at twenty-four years of age they might be admitted to priest's orders. This final examination, I think, should be confined chiefly to their knowledge of pastoral work and duties. As a rule, I fear that the great bulk of our clergy do not remain more than one year in deacon's orders, and during that time, having before their minds the prospect of another examination in a year's time, they are kept back from doing the work they ought to do as deacons. I think if they were told that they would have no further examination at which they could be plucked, for three years after they were ordained deacons, they would have plenty of time to learn their work as clergymen, and to come up for priests' orders in a very different state from that in which so many do come up at the present time. I hope the standard of examination for orders will never be lowered, except in special cases. For though I thoroughly agree with the admission of non-graduates to the ministry, of course I wish that men should be as highly educated as possible. Still I know that some of the most devoted of our clergy are men who have never received a university education, and I feel ashamed to think that such men should not be as highly honoured as they deserve. There are numbers of men who would come to us if we would open the ministry to them; and I rejoice that the bishop of this diocese has by his "Probationer System" opened the door to all who feel they have a call for the ministry. It has been a bold yet successful effort. I would venture upon one step further. Nothing strengthens the influence of the Church amongst the working classes so much as the fact that many of them can say they have a brother or a near

* "None shall be admitted a deacon, except he be twenty-three years of age, unless he have a faculty."—*Preface to Ordination Service.*

relative who is a clergyman. I can venture to say that in the principality with which I am connected, it does much to soften the asperities between Churchmen and Dissenters when a Dissenter can say, "I have a son or a brother who is a parson."

Rev. Wm. Caine, M.A.

The scarcity in the supply of clergymen is a very painful truth. I have had great experience in the education of clergymen. More than a hundred of my pupils are clergymen in all parts of the kingdom; I therefore feel a great interest in this subject, and wish to state a fact which I believe is one of the causes of this scarcity. There is a feeling of dissatisfaction among the young clergy with regard to promotion. I can bear testimony to the fact that the most ignorant of my pupils are those who are placed the highest in the Church. That is a great disgrace. Men of merit and learning ought to be promoted over ignorant men who happen to be related to patrons. I know sons and relatives of Lord Chancellors and bishops who are raised to canonries and other high positions in the Church, who are far inferior to men who have never been promoted beyond a curacy. Young men, of course, ought to enter the ministry from the highest and holiest motives, but we cannot help seeing that great injustice is done by patrons, and I wish to raise a protest against it at this Congress, as I did at Nottingham some years ago, when I had more time than I have this afternoon. Mention has been made of young men being taken as probationers into parishes. Now I think, as the result of long experience, that a man who is employed as a probationer or Scripture reader in a parish ought not to be made the curate of that parish, because we know that our Saviour has said that "a prophet has no honour in his own country." It is far better that a curate should come into the parish who has not laboured there before. He is received with much greater respect—not that he deserves it, perhaps—than the Scripture reader. Again, I think that a young man ought to be kept reading his Greek Testament and books of theology as much as possible before his ordination. We want more learning amongst the clergy at this critical period in the history of the Church. A number of young men at the present day are ordained who know very little of the Greek Testament or of theology, and I think the more they devote themselves to the study of theology, and at least the Greek Testament, if not the Hebrew Bible, the better they will be fitted for the office of a clergyman. I quite appreciate Mr Christopher's admirable paper, and heartily agree with him; but there are other motives that must be taken into consideration.

The proceedings closed with the Benediction.

THURSDAY EVENING, 7th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took the Chair at Seven o'Clock.

RECENT EXPLORATIONS AND DISCOVERIES IN BIBLE LANDS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. F. W. Holland, M.A., Vicar of Evesham, Worcestershire.

"Explorations in Bible Lands" formed one of the subjects discussed at the Church Congress, held at Liverpool in 1869, and it seems fitting therefore in the present instance to confine the somewhat vague term "recent explorations and discoveries" to those that have been made since that time. I have been assigned the duty of describing to you the explorations and discoveries made in those Bible lands which are connected with the history of the Exodus, viz., the land of Egypt, and the peninsula of Sinai.

I have not myself had an opportunity of visiting those lands, since I returned in 1869 from the Sinai Ordnance Survey Expedition, but I have gained by several visits a knowledge of them which has enabled me to follow out what has been done by others, and to express an independent opinion upon the various points to which their attention has been directed.

In the autumn of 1869, Professor Palmer, who had been one of the members of the Sinai Survey Expedition, set out again for the peninsula, accompanied by the late Mr C. F. Tyrwhitt-Drake, under the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund, with the object of exploring the Wilderness of the Tíh, or Wanderings, which lies to the south of Palestine, and also the Land of Moab, to which attention had been especially drawn by the discovery of the famous Moabite stone.

They were directed to explore on their way the district lying at the head of Wády Gharandel, and that to the north of 'Ain Hudherah, including the line of mountains which forms the southern edge of the Tíh plateau.

A knowledge of these tracts of country was essential to the completion of the map of the peninsula, and might, it was thought, throw some additional light upon the route of the children of Israel.

Wády Wutah, at the head of Wády Gharandel, had been mentioned as a pass by which the Israelites might have journeyed towards Mount

Sinai. Professor Palmer found it to be narrow and winding. He also describes the pass at the head of this wády as being a very steep and difficult one.

Information of this kind, although of a negative character, is most valuable; in this case it renders it almost absolutely certain that the children of Israel, as they journeyed to Mount Sinai (Jebel Musa), must have taken the usual route followed by Arabs and travellers across Wády Gharandel, and over the plateau on the N.E. of Jebel Hummam.

After visiting Jebel Musa, Professor Palmer and Mr Drake proceeded to endeavour to trace out the probable route of the Israelites from Mount Sinai to Kadesh. Turning out of Wády es Sheikh at the tomb of Nebi Sáleh, they struck into Wády Sáal, and proceeded to 'Ain Hunherah, which is generally supposed to mark the site of Hazeroth, the second station of the Israelites after they removed from Mount Sinai.

On the way to 'Ain Hudherah, Professor Palmer examined again the curious remains at Erweis el Ebeirig, and writes that he "still found every reason for adhering to his first impression, that they are really relics of the Israelitish camp of Kibroth Hattaavah," "The graves of lust"—where the people lusted for flesh, and the quails were sent a second time in wrath. In the official report of the Ordnance Survey, Professor Palmer thus describes this remarkable place: "Here the watershed of a broad valley is covered with small enclosures of stones, evidently the remains of a large encampment, though utterly unlike the other traces of Arab camps in the peninsula. On the summit of a neighbouring hill is an erection of rough, unhewn stones, surmounted by a conspicuous white block of a pyramidal shape. These, the Arabs say, are the remains of the encampment of a large pilgrim or Hajj caravan, who, in remote ages, pitched their tents on this spot when on their way to Hazeroth, and who were lost immediately afterwards in the desert of the Tîh, and never again heard of."

While entirely agreeing with Professor Palmer, "that the length of time that has elapsed since the events of the Exodus furnishes no argument against the probability of his conclusion, as there are many monuments in the country in even better preservation, and of a date far anterior," I cannot agree with him in this identification, or in that of 'Ain Hudherah with Hazeroth, because it appears to me improbable that the children of Israel on their march from Mount Sinai to Kadesh should have been led eastwards towards the gulf of Akaba, and into the narrow, winding valleys which lie to the north and east of 'Ain Huthera, rather than across the open plateau of Zeranik, which leads up to Wády Zelleger, and so to the passes of the range of Jebel el Ejmeh.

I cannot hear of any one besides myself having traversed this plateau, which forms the central watershed of the peninsula; I was obliged to make a forced march across it, having run short of both food and water, and I could not examine it so fully as I wished, but I was much struck by the very easy route which it would afford to any large body of persons travelling northwards from Jebel Musa, and also by the large number of primitive dwellings and ancient stone enclosures, such as doubtless gave the name to Hazeroth.

The discovery of these "nawámis," or "mosquito houses," as the Arabs call them, believing that they were built by the children of Israel

to protect themselves from the attacks of mosquitoes, is one of great interest, for they are probably the dwellings and storehouses of the ancient Amalekites whom the Israelites drove out of the land at the battle of Rephidim. Circles of stones, such as we call "Druids' Circles," are not unfrequently to be found near the nawamis, and excavations prove that they were sepulchral monuments. I have also found apparent traces of terraced gardens connected with some of these dwellings, a fact which would seem to imply a certain amount of cultivation, and probably the growth of fruit-trees.

The south-eastern passes, which lead up to the plateau of the Tîh through the range of Jebel et Ejmeh, have not yet been fully explored; but that of El Mírád, or "The Watering-place," which was discovered by Professor Palmer and Mr Drake, is described as not difficult, and was probably that by which the Israelites left the Wilderness of Sinai.

We will now turn to the late Dr Beke's expedition in search of Mount Sinai, and however much I may differ from his opinions, I cannot speak without respect of that veteran traveller. I believe him to have been utterly mistaken, but I know that he was thoroughly earnest in his desire to throw fresh light upon sacred history, and one must admire the zeal and energy which led him when seventy years of age to undertake so arduous a journey, in order to establish the truth of his theory, that Mount Sinai must have been at the time of the exodus an active volcano, the fire from whose crater formed "the pillar of fire" which gave light to the children of Israel by night, and its smoke the pillar of cloud which guided them by day.

Dr Beke himself owned that this theory proved to be a false one; but on his arrival at Akaba he heard of a mountain not far distant called Jebel en Nur, or "The Mountain of Light." This he visited, and at once declared it to be "the true Mount Sinai." On the summit he found the remains of sacrificed animals, and lower down some Sinaitic inscriptions; the Arabs also told him that "on it God spoke to Moses," and therefore they stop and pray towards it. Dr Beke was of opinion that the Egypt of the exodus was not in Egypt at all, but further eastwards, in the Desert of the Tîh: he also held that the children of Israel never entered the southern portion of the peninsula of Sinai, but crossed the Tîh plateau direct to the head of the Gulf of Akaba, which he believed to be the Red Sea of the exodus.

I do not think that these theories will be considered worthy of discussion; but with regard to "The Mountain of Light," I will merely say that it is by no means an uncommon thing for the Bedouins to sacrifice animals on the tops of mountains; that there are many places in the peninsula which their traditions point to in connection with the history of Moses, and God's communications with him; and lastly, that the Sinaitic inscriptions have been proved to be of a very much later date than the time of the exodus, and have nothing whatever to do with the history of the Israelites.

I am astonished to find how many persons still believe in Mr Foster's theory, which he worked out so cleverly (and, I may add, so earnestly and sincerely), that the Sinaitic inscriptions were the work of the children of Israel. Had he visited the peninsula himself, he would have discovered that the grounds on which he based his theory were not trust-

worthy; and more than this, he would have seen, as I have seen and copied, most distinct bilingual inscriptions, made indisputably by the same hand; and as these contain both Greek and Sinaitic characters, it is quite clear that the Israelites did not make them. It so happens that the clearest of all the bilingual inscriptions (one cut in a peculiar manner with a chisel, instead of with a rough flint, as most of the inscriptions were) is the very one which Mr Foster has interpreted as containing an account of the battle of Rephidim, and in which he read the names of Moses, Aaron, and Hur.

The Greek names in that inscription are plainly introduced in the Sinaitic inscription with which it is coupled, and thus is afforded a key to the Sinaitic character which, as Professor Palmer could tell you, he or any other orientalist can read without the slightest difficulty. It is not known exactly who the writers were, but they were evidently inhabitants, and not mere travellers, and the inscriptions contain merely their names, with such common expressions as "Peace be to him," or "May he be remembered."

I must not pass by without notice Dr Eber's work on Sinai. He does not appear to have covered any new ground, or to have spent much time in exploring the old. He accepts Jebel Serbal as Mount Sinai, and his views upon the route of the Israelites from the Red Sea to Sinai, and upon the position of the Mount of the Law-giving, are almost identical with those of Professor Lepsius. The great value of his work appears to consist in his remarks as an Egyptologist, and in his skilful manner of handling the literary questions of the exodus. But as his book is known to me only through reviews, I cannot, of course, pretend to criticise it.

He suggests, however, one identification, which appears to me likely to prove of great value, as helping to fix an unknown station in the route of the Israelites. He recognises in Dophka the Egyptian word Maphka, which means copper, and suggests that this place was connected with the districts where copper-mines were worked, either at Serábit el Khadim, or at Wády Maghárah. Professor Palmer hazards a conjecture that the name might have been given to some point on the coast between Wady Taiyebeh and Wady Feiran. My last discovery in the peninsula was an extensive copper-smelting ground exactly half-way between those two spots. I should not, however, myself place Dophka exactly there.

We come now to an entirely new view of the exodus, which is as startling as it is original, and yet it is apparently founded upon evidence which cannot be controverted. Brugsch-Bey, whose name as an Egyptologist is widely known, and whose reputation stands exceedingly high wherever it is known, first in a lecture which was delivered in Egypt, and published at Alexandria, and secondly in a paper read at the Congress of Orientalists held in London last year, has propounded the theory that the passage of the Israelites, and the destruction of the army of Pharaoh, did not take place at the Red Sea at all, but on the shores of the Mediterranean.

After pointing out that we ought not to expect to find on the Egyptian monuments any direct record of the loss of Pharaoh's army, and that if any such record should be found, the facts would probably be purposely misrepresented, for the Egyptians would not care to record a defeat, he adds that we must look for *indirect* allusions to the exodus; and happily

the monuments, and especially *the papyri*, have preserved in a remarkable manner this indirect witness to the truth of the Bible narrative. As an example, he quotes an official letter written in the time of Rameses II., which has been deciphered from a papyrus in the Leyden Museum, one passage of which runs thus—"I have obeyed the order given by my Lord, saying, Give corn to the soldiers as well as to the Hebrews, who draw the stone to the great fortress of the city of Rameses, and who are under the orders of the captain Amenemany." The writer of this roll, says Brugsch-Bey, had not the least *wish* to give us any information bearing on what is now so familiar to us as Hebrew history, but his words, independently written and translated, have obviously a vast importance in their bearing on it.

We read in the Book of Exodus of the groaning of the children of Israel under the burdens of the Egyptians, and of their being employed under taskmasters in making bricks, and in building for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses (Exod. i. 11). The names of both these cities are found in the Egyptian inscriptions as Pi-Tom, and Pi-Ramses, *i.e.*, "the city of the god Tom" and "*the city of Rameses*," the prefix *Pi* meaning "*the city.*"

The papyrus records prove that it was Rameses II., who founded a city called after himself. Hence *he* may safely be assumed to be the Pharaoh referred to who employed the Hebrews to build it.

The name of the captain being mentioned proves that they worked under armed guards, and drawings at Thebes show the system actually carried on under taskmasters armed with long sticks, one of whom is exclaiming, "*The stick is in my hand, be ye not idle.*"

Rameses was the sanctuary of the god Ammon, and was built not only as a treasure-city, but also as a fortification, to protect the country from the attacks of enemies on the east. Ancient Egyptian records have enabled Brugsch-Bey to identify it as forming one part of the city, Zan, the Zoan of the Psalmist and Tanis of the Greeks, the site of which is known.

There exists in the British Museum a long Egyptian poem, which describes in glowing language the glories of the city of Rameses, and gives a description of the vessels which arrived there, that proves its connection with the sea. And engraved on one of the walls of the great temple at Carnac there is a plan of Tanis, made in the reign of Séti I., the father of Rameses II., in which crocodiles and aquatic plants prove it to be on the Nile, while in one corner the representation of sea-fish show its connection with the sea. The excavations of M. Mariette Bey abundantly prove how important a town it was.

To have fixed the site of Rameses, the starting-point of the children of Israel, is indeed a great gain. But Brugsch-Bey has been enabled to do far more than this.

The monuments record the existence of a *province* east of it called Thuku, the Succoth of Scripture, of which Pitom was the capital; while the name Goshen is the Phakusa of the Greeks, the *Pha* being the masculine article usually added to geographical names, and Phakusan being simply "The Goshen," or "Goshen," as the Exodus writes it.

Again, the monuments and papyri prove conclusively that the population of Pitom, Rameses, and Goshen were a *mixed* population of Phœni-

cian origin, the names of the places in these districts being clearly not Egyptian.

Thus, just as M. Ganneau has discovered in Palestine traces of the old Canaanite inhabitants, so has M. Mariette discovered on the shores of Lake Menzaleh traditions and other evidence of traces of the "*mixed people*," some of whom marched out of Egypt with the Israelites.

Another ancient papyrus preserved in the British Museum says—"We have given a free passage to some tribes of Bedouins from the land of Edom, at the fortress of Pharaoh Maneptah, which is in the district of Succoth, that they and their cattle may find food in the dominion of Pharaoh." Here again we have exact illustration of the settlement of Jacob's family in the same spot, when they were driven by famine from their own country.

We have seen how Brugsch-Bey claims to have fixed the sites of Rameses and Succoth, the two first stations of the Israelites.

Another papyrus throws still further light upon the subject. The writer had pursued two servants of his master who had fled from Rameses. He left that place on the ninth day of the month Epiphi, and reached Succoth on the tenth. On arriving at Chetem, "The Fort," which may be identified with Etham of the Exodus, he was told that the fugitives had passed by a place called "The Wall," north of the Migdol of King Séti Menephthah. Both "The Wall" and Migdol are well known from other documents, and were on the high road to Palestine. Migdol, the Magdolos of the Greeks, may be identified with the Migdol between which and the sea the children of Israel were to "turn and encamp before Pihahiroth, over against Baal-Zephon." About twenty-five miles east of Port Said is situated Lake Serbonis, which a long bar of sand separates from the Mediterranean Sea. At the north-east of this lake stands Mons Cassius, and Brugsch-Bey has, it appears, found evidence that a temple dedicated to the god Baal-Zephon was situated here, while he believes that he has discovered the Egyptian name of which Pihahiroth is the transcription, and that it signifies the same as the *βάραθρα*, or *abysses* of Lake Serbonis. The Israelites he supposes to have made their way along the bar of sand towards Baal-Zephon, and Pharaoh's host which followed them to have been swallowed up by a sudden rise of the sea, just as, according to Diodorus, Artaxerxes lost his army almost on the same spot.

The wilderness of Shur, or "The Wall," which the Israelites next crossed, going three days without finding any water (Exod. xv. 22), would be that between Lake Serbonis and the head of the Gulf of Suez. The bitter waters of Marah, Brugsch-Bey identifies with the Bitter Lakes in the Isthmus of Suez, and Elim with the Wells of Moses.

He does not attempt to follow the children of Israel further than this towards Sinai.

I am myself utterly incompetent to give any opinion with regard to the etymological identifications, but I believe that the leading Egyptologists have great faith in Brugsch-Bey's translations; and as far as geographical considerations are concerned, I see nothing in his theory contradictory to the Bible narrative. The most startling point is the denial of the passage through what we now call "The Red Sea." But it is only in our translation that the sea through which the Israelites passed

is called "Red;" the Hebrew has "Yam Suph," "The Sea of Weeds," or simply "The Sea."

But it may be asked, If this new theory be true, what becomes of the result of your own explorations in the Peninsula of Sinai?

I do not see that it materially affects that. I have always spoken of the first portion of the route of the Israelites as being very uncertain up to the time of their arrival at Ayoun Musa, where I imagined they encamped immediately after they had crossed the Red Sea.

If we are now to identify that spot with Elim, the encampment by the sea mentioned as the next station in Numbers xxx. must be placed some fifteen miles lower down the coast, and the wilderness of Sin would comprise the southern portion of that coast-plain, the part which lies between Taset-es-Sudr and Wady Gharandel.

Under these altered circumstances, I should be inclined to go back to my former opinion, that the Israelites, after passing Jebel Hummam, instead of keeping down the coast to Wady Feiran, took the upper and more direct road to Jebel Musa, by Serábit el Khadim, where I would place Dophkah, in accordance with Dr Eber's suggestion.

Until, however, Brugsch-Bey's system has been discussed by other Egyptologists, and the geographical bearings of the route suggested by him have been thoroughly explored, as I trust it will be next spring, I shall withhold myself from forming any definite opinion upon it.

At all events, the identification of Rameses appears conclusive. We now have a point to start from, and we have had opened out for us a fresh mine of wealth in the monuments and papyri of Egypt, which, if it has not already yielded us true gold, will do so sooner or later. We cannot be too thankful for each additional link that is given us in the chain of evidence, direct or indirect, that helps to illustrate the historical truth of the sacred records.

It is a duty which we owe to ourselves, and to those who shall come after us, to collect fresh evidence from every quarter. It seems to me that this is a trust which God in these days has especially committed to us. Let us carry it out *boldly*, yet *wisely*, with humble prayer to Him, that, by so doing, we may be the means of promoting a knowledge of the truth, and thus adding to His honour and glory.

Captain Warren, R.E.

Since the papers on this subject were read before the Church Congress held at Liverpool in 1869, the discoveries in Bible lands have been both numerous and important, particularly in Palestine.

The excavations which in 1869 were in full progress, both at Jerusalem and elsewhere, have been suspended for a season, but only to give place to a not less important operation—an operation which could not be delayed, I mean the Trigonometrical Survey of the Holy Land.

The absolute necessity for a systematic survey became to me apparent from my first introduction to the country in 1867, and I did not cease to urge its prosecution until its commencement in 1871.

It was evident that while the archæological treasures hidden in the ground might wait safely for a few years, it was far otherwise with those above ground.

Ancient names were becoming lost, traditions forgotten, ruins destroyed, and this, strange to say, due to a slight emergence of that country from utter adversity.

The Franks, who are seeking the information stored in Palestine, are at the same time attended by the means with which it will in a few years be completely destroyed out of the land; for with them have entered European customs and civilisation, which are rapidly changing the people, and leading them, in a measure, to cast off their Eastern life. It is strange, and yet it is a fact, that it is to the impoverished state, the ruined condition, in which Palestine generally has continued during so many hundred years since the fall of the Roman Empire, that we now enjoy the opportunity of gathering up those items of information; for it is obvious that if the country had been subject to the full tide of prosperity—if the lands had been fully cultivated, the ruins rebuilt, that new ideas would have sprung up, and much of the tradition lost. And please mark this, that our time for collecting is short: the merchant with his civilising influence is at hand, and in a few years all power of gathering will be lost; and yet it is at such a time, when the archæological harvest in Palestine is plenteous, the labourers are eager for employment, that the means are not forthcoming, the treasury is nearly empty.

It was not imagined that during the progress of the survey any great discoveries would be made; at the utmost it might have been expected that there would be a few incidental identifications.

The object of the survey is to secure a good general map of the country, based on an accurate system of triangulation—a map that will show every village, large ruin, and prominent point distinctly marked, by the aid of which it would be easy for any persons closely acquainted with biblical history to search over the land in detail, to pursue the various subjects, and grapple with them on the spot, and having grasped them, to insert their fresh information on the map. Thus every scholar who visits the Holy Land will have the opportunity of making any additions, and giving them to the world through the medium of the Palestine Exploration Fund, instead of being compelled to stow them away in the silent recesses of his pocket-book, or to go to some expense in publishing isolated facts, which by themselves may not be of general interest.

The survey is the means to a great and important end. But it has also borne fruit itself, for the energy, skill, and thoughtful research which Lieutenant Conder and the late Mr T. Drake have brought to bear on the subject, have given us results which far outreach our expectations, and have enabled us during the last three years, month by month, to be placed in possession of ever-increasing items of information, which in some cases have led to complete identifications, in others have tended to advance the subject treated of by many stages.

Discoveries in Palestine may be classed as positive and negative, the former being the direct identifications, the latter cases where one or more solutions to a question are proved untenable, leaving the inference that the remaining solution is correct.

Probably the most thankless task, the sternest duty, of the explorer is the reducing to an absurdity some of the theories that at present exist: so long as they are believed in, he finds his efforts laughed to scorn: as soon as he has overthrown them, they are forgotten, and his services likewise. It is the man who makes a positive discovery who alone can expect his services to be recognised by the world at large, and yet possibly more than treble the amount of labour must be spent on the subjects leading to negative discoveries (on work which is forgotten). The recent discoveries belong to both classes, and I will, as far as the shortness of time admits of, give you a brief description of some of them. For this purpose I now produce before you, for the first time in England, my reconnaissance sheets of parts of Palestine, one showing the whole of the Jordan Valley below Tiberius, and the east as far as the Haj route (3000 square miles); the other showing the Plain of Philistia (1200 square miles). This first is among those which have recently been honourably mentioned at the Paris Geographical Exhibition. They are now embodied in Murray's new map of Palestine, and are the only plans at present published which in any degree give the general features of the ground and positions of places with tolerable correctness.

During the past four years many hundred places have been carefully examined and described; and while upwards of eighty new identifications have been proposed, as many more old ones have been confirmed. I here possess a list, but time only allows me to speak of those of most importance.

Ancient Name.	Modern Name.	Proposer.	Remarks.
Stone of Zoheleth	Ez Zehwèlé	C. Ganneau	
Enrogel	Virgin's Fountain	C. Warren C. Ganneau	
King's Gardens	Wady Feraun	,,	
Asal	Wady Yazsal	,,	
Valley of Hinnom	Wady Feraun	C. Warren	
Royal Tombs	Cotton Grotto	,,	
Nebo (town)	Nebeh	,,	
Pisgah	Jebl Siaga	Prof. Porter Prof. Paine	
,,	Mushkar	C. Warren	
Makkedah	Moghar	,,	
,, (Onamasticon)	Sheikh Mudkor	,,	
Harith	Hérché	C. Ganneau	
Manocho	Malha	,,	
Sarsaba	Kurn Sartaba	,,	
Geser	Tell el Jezer	,,	
,,	Tell Jazar	T. Drake	
Kirjaith Jearim	Jeba	C. Ganneau	

Ancient Name.	Modern Name.	Proposer.	Remarks.
Bezka	El Yezek	C. Ganneau	
Har-Rakkon Mijarkon	Oyûn Kara	,,	
Sharon	Zernûka	,,	
Beth-Dagon	Dajûn	,,	
Eben	Deir Eban	,,	
Ain Gannim	Umm Jina	,,	
Ashnah	Asalin	,,	
	Idhnah	C. Conder	
Tappuah	Artuf	C. Ganneau	
Sharaim	Sâîrè	,,	
	Shameh	C. Warren	
Boskath	Beshît	,,	
Gath	Huleikât	,,	
Enam	Bir en Nahl	,,	
Ether	Hatta	,,	
	K. 'Atr	C. Conder	
Jephta	Beit Affa	C. Warren	
Dilean	Bâlin	,,	
Libnah	Ibneh	,,	
	Beit Jebrin	C. Conder	
Cabbon	Abu Kabûs	C. Warren	
,,	Kebu	,,	
Dilean	Eilin	,,	
Shephalah	Es-Sifla	,,	
		C. Ganneau	
Aven Hash-Sheteyah	Little Sakhrah	C. Warren	
,,	Great ,,	Dr Chaplin	
Sorek	Surar	C. Ganneau	
		C. Conder	
Jethlah	Shilta	T. Drake	
Helkath Hazzarim	Wady el Askar	,,	
Asher	Asirah	,,	
Aner	'Anim	,,	
Bileam	Ibleam	,,	
Rabbith	Arrabeh	,,	
Amad (Asher)	Umm al Amad	,,	
Adummin	Tilat ed Damm	,,	
Mozah	K. Dayt Mizzeh	,,	
Beth Shitta	Shatta	,,	
Bene Berak	Ibn Ibrak	,,	
Adullam	Aid el Meyé	C. Ganneau	
Eshtaol	Eshúá	Sergeant Black	
Etam	Beit 'Atab	,,	
	'Ain Atan	T. Drake	
Sorek	Wady Surar	C. Conder	
Gilgal	Jiljulieh	Zschokke	Very doubtful
		C. Conder	
Gilgal	Jeljul (near Es Sumrah)	C. Warren	Very doubtful
Oreb	'Ash al Ghorah	C. Conder	Doubtful
Teeb	Tuw-ayl ed Diab	,,	
Maarath	Mird	T. Drake	
Middin	,,	C. Conder	
Choresh of Zif	Khoreisa (near Tel Zif)	,,	
Hareth	Kharás	,,	
Hachilah	Nebi Yekin	,,	
Debir	El Dhoherćyeh	,,	
Zanoah	K. Sanûh	,,	
Eshtemoá	Semúá	,,	
Heshmon	El Meshash	,,	
Luz	Khirbet Lozeh	,,	
Chozeba	Kmizibah	,,	
Ma'areth	W. el Moghair	,,	
Arab	K. el 'Arabiyeh	,,	
Cliff of Zir	K. Aziz	C. Conder	
Moladah	Tell el Milh	,,	
Hazar Gaddah	El Ghurra	,,	

Ancient Name.	Modern Name.	Proposer.	Remarks.
Hazar Shual	Sáweh	C. Conder	Doubtful
Dannah	Domeh	,,	
Anun	El Dilbeh	,,	
Goshen	Zekiyeh	,,	
Bathabara	Makhádet 'Abára	,,	
Antipatris	K. Ras el 'Ain	C. W. Wilson	
Nob	Nebi Samewil	C. Conder	Very doubtful
Mzpeh	,,	,,	
Laish	L'Isawiyeh	,,	
Gallim	Khirbet el Soma	,,	
Gebim	El Jib	,,	
Madmaneh	Bir Nebála	,,	
Ed	Kurn Sartaba	,,	
Œnon	Faráh	Robinson C. Conder	Doubtful
Adadeh	Adadeh	,,	
Ashan	K. Hazanah	,,	
Achzib	Kussah	,,	

Castles of the Middle Ages.

Galatia	Keratiya	C. Conder
Plans	Kalens a wièh	,,
Mœn	Tantura	,,
Arnald	Latrun	,,

This list is only approximately correct; no doubt several new identifications have been omitted, and perhaps a few credited as new discoveries which have been found before, but are not generally known.

Makkedah.—The identification of the Royal Canaanitish city Makkedah with the village of El Moghâr was proposed by me in 1871, and recent collateral researches of M. Ganneau and observations of Lieutenant Conder go far to confirm the proposition.

Joshua xv. 41, the following towns occur together :—Gederoth, Beth-dagon, and Naameh, and Makkedah.

When I visited Philistra in 1867, the identification of the three first with the villages of Kutrah, Beit Dejan, and Nianeh was already surmised, and it occurred to me that the village El Moghâr (the caves) opposite to, and half a mile north of, Kutrah, was the modern representative of the royal city of Makkedah. On examination of the site, I found a considerable number of rock-cut caves, many of which I heard were of considerable size; but I was not able to examine them at that time, because they had but just been filled with corn from the harvest. There were also indications of extensive remains, as of a large city and rock-cut tombs. I could, however, hear nothing of the large cave which I expected to find; and in the absence of this, and the distance of Beit Dejan, twelve miles to north, I felt that the identification could not be urged very strongly.

The discovery by M. Ganneau of Dejan, the representative of Beth Dagon, only about two miles east of El Moghâr and Kutrah, has considerably strengthened my proposition. To this may be added the recent careful examination of the site by Lieutenant Conder, which he undertook at my request; this, though throwing little additional light of importance on the subject, has found no flaws in the evidence, and has led him to consider it as a pretty satisfactory identification. Lieutenant Conder examined many of the caves, but found them all small. One certainly could

contain five men, and one had five loculi within; but it appears to me that *the cave* of Makkedah was an extensive cavern, capable of holding not only the five kings pursued by Joshua, but also their retainers. In any case, it is spoken of as *the cave*, indicating that in some manner it was remarkable.

As there are all over Palestine villages surrounded with caves small and great, it appears to me probable that the name El Moghâr is one which has been handed down from the early inhabitants, as indicating the site of a remarkable cave; and what cave more remarkable in that portion of Palestine than that in which the five kings were immured and afterwards buried. It is quite possible that the cave itself may have remained closed up to this day, the tradition hanging to the spot, and the Hebrew name, *the Cave*, being changed to the Arabic name, *the Caves*.

The position of El Moghâr might well have been chosen for a royal city. It is situated on the northern side of a narrow *tajo*, which the valley of Sorek has scooped through the sandstone hills. Immediately south is Kutrah (Gedroth); to the west Dejan (Beth Dagon); north-east, Akir (Ekron); and about three miles further north-east, Nianeh (Naameh).

It is about seven miles south-west of Ramleh, in the position, or nearly so, where the writer of article Makkedah, Smith's "Biblical Dictionary," proposes it may be found.

There are many reasons, which I cannot here dwell upon, in favour of this site, which I may now strongly urge as a probable identification, the site deserving a very rigid examination, as, until the cave itself is found, the identification must remain uncertain.

Adullam.—The necessity for avoiding hasty inferences as to identifications is exemplified in the case of Adullam, the position of which during the last few years has been indicated at six or seven separate spots. Even so late as 1874 a fresh position was assigned and abandoned.

During this year, again, another position has been proposed; and though there is much to be said in its favour, yet I agree with M. Ganneau, who proposes it, that however strong the probability may be, we are yet far from speaking with certainty.

We have, however, got one happy result from the discussions as to its position which have lately taken place—viz., that though we may not have the actual cave and ruins of the royal city, yet we appear to have arrived at a general agreement as to the spot where it should be found, so that a little more search may lead us to a complete identification.

According to monastic tradition, the cave of Adullam is one with the cavern of Kureitun, near Tekoa and Bethlehem, accounts of which have frequently been published. It has long been felt, however, that this position did not satisfy the requirements of the sacred narrative, and many other sites have been proposed, such as Deir Dubban, Deir Aban, Deir Doula, &c., at some of which there are very remarkable and extensive caverns and remains of cities. We have to look for Adullam in the Shephalah, or low country; not along the seaboard, but in the undulating country at the foot of the hills of Judah. The most correct term would be the *wolds* of Philistia, near Jermuk and Socho, both which sites have been identified.

Not far from these places, on the west side of Wady Sûr (the probable valley of Elah), is to be found a ruin named Ed el Miyé; and to M.

Ganneau is due the credit of having been struck with the resemblance of this name to Adullam, for, in fact, it contains the same essential letters (*A d l m*). The name in Arabic means "the feast of the hundred," and refers to a tradition to which at present little importance may be attached. The hill-side above this ruin is pitted with small natural caves, in which Lieutenant Conder has suggested that David and his outlaws found accommodation. Near the summit is a grotto and wely, sacred to Shiekh Mudkor, shown in my reconnaissance of Philistia. I draw attention to this name, because I think Mudkor will be found to have a connection with the Makkedah described in the Onomasticon as being (as far as we can judge) on this very spot. The Syriac name for Makkedah is Mokor.

Lieutenant Conder proposes that only small caves can ever have been used as habitations, the large caves being unsuitable from damp, darkness, &c., and that therefore Adullam was not a large cave, but a series of small caves. In this I cannot coincide. I am of opinion that all the large circular caverns in Palestine, with staircases cut in them, were once human habitations, and that the cave of Adullam will be found to be a cavern of extensive dimensions. I have, however, carefully examined this same district, and could see and hear nothing of any such cave, except one about two miles east, near Umm Burj; nevertheless, I cordially agree with M. Ganneau and Lieutenant Conder as to the position assigned to Adullam, expecting the large cavern to be found hereafter.

In the Jordan Valley the identifications proposed by Lieutenant Conder and M. Ganneau are numerous, and many of them are likely to be adopted generally.

Altar Ed.—Take, for example, the Altar Ed, erected by the two tribes and a half on the west of Jordan, when on their return to the east, as a "witness" that they were one with their brethren on the other side of the river. Lieut. Conder has very skilfully argued that this altar was erected on the peak of Kurn Surtabeh, and has found a pass up the mount called the "going up to Ed." Kurn Surtabeh is a conical peak of a headland projecting from the Judean hills into the Jordan valley. It is the most conspicuous object in the Jordan valley, and would no doubt have played an important part in times when hill-tops were so much used, both as places of sacrifice and as positions for towns. On the summit of this mount is a ruin of bevelled stones, which Lieutenant Conder argues was the famous altar. In favour of this site there is much to be said. I must confess, however, that when I examined these ruins, I supposed, and still think, them to be those of an ancient citadel connected with a town somewhat lower down. The Bedouin certainly then asserted that there had been here a city, and showed me the remains of an aqueduct by which water was brought in from a spring some miles distant. I am also under the impression that the altar of Ed was built close to the river Jordan, on the bank. Kurn Surtabeh, however, has other claims on our attention. It is without doubt the Surtaba (see Robinson), mentioned in the Talmud as being the first station to which the signal regarding the advent of the full moon was sent from Olivet on its way to the Captivity. The next station I have to suggest was Kulat er Rabad, close to Keferenjy, on the east side of Jordan, called Gryphena. M. Ganneau also argues that the Captain of the Lord's host (Sarsaba) appeared to Joshua (v. 13–15) upon this mountain, from

whence its name may have been obtained. Whether there is sufficient ground for this argument, it would perhaps be premature to judge at present. The fact that Palestine is now so well known in parts that such arguments can be advanced is what I wish more particularly to call attention to. They may themselves eventually be found to be unstable, but they can scarcely fail to assist in lighting up the whole subject, and thus be instrumental in giving us some identifications which are not to be controverted.

Oreb and Zeeb.—To the south of Kurn Surtabeh, and near to Jericho, is another prominent headland very similar in appearance, but smaller, named Ash el Ghorab (the raven's nest). Some two miles to the north of this there is a valley called Wady ed Dîb (the valley of the wolf), and Lieutenant Conder has proposed to identify these with the rock Oreb (raven) and the wine-press of Zeeb (wolf). I do not myself think that juxtaposition of these names at such a probable spot is more than a coincidence, as the valleys of the wolf are very frequent in Palestine; but I would point to the proposal as evidence that much careful thought is being bestowed on the work now going on in Palestine by the officers employed.

Quite a flood of light has been thrown on the whole of this valley during the past three years by the careful descriptions of the officers of the Fund; and though no startling discoveries, several most satisfactory identifications of minor importance have been made, and the knowledge of many places of great interest has been advanced a stage. For example, the site of Gilgal: Lieut. Conder has advanced some strong arguments in favour of its position near the Shajret el Ithlé (shown on my map), while Mr Drake argued against it in the discussion. My own impression is that Gilgal is not yet found, but I have little doubt that the ruin shown to Lieutenant Conder, and which I know well, is of some town of importance.

The Jeljulia (Gilgal) of the Jordan Valley appears to have a "Will-o'-the-wisp" nature. In 1867 it was shown to me as identical with Es Sumrah, to north of 'Ain es Sultan; but in the following year I could hear nothing of the name there, it was evidently not a true name.

There is very much yet to be discovered in this great basin. As one of the three or four Europeans now living who have been up and down both banks of the river, I can assert, from what I have observed, that an expedition to that valley alone would richly repay the trouble taken, by opening up the mines of information now lying beneath or remaining floating on the surface of the ground in the shape of traditions.

Nebo.—The heights of Nebo were first identified in 1863–64 by three parties, who visited them independently. To M. de Sauley is due the credit of having first caught up the name, and applied it in April 1863; but he did not visit Nebo, and it is doubtful even whether he saw it. The Duc de Luynes camped at Ayun Musa, April 1864, and ascended Nebo, which he calls Jebl Musa; and though he evidently recognised the position, yet he does not appear to have caught the name of Nebo.

Only ten days after, Canon Tristram ascended Nebo, and also visited the Ayun Musa.

These were all, however, very hasty visits, and no information was given the world as to the relative positions of Nebo and the Springs of Moses until I visited the country in 1867. I then made the sketch of

which you now see before you a copy. I ascertained that there were several heights of Nebo, discovered the ancient town and temple of same name, and gave a description.

Since then the spot has been visited once or twice, but more particularly by Professor Paine and Lieutenant Stever, of the United States Palestine Exploration Fund. A volume of ninety pages has been devoted to the subject by Professor Paine, giving a large amount of very valuable information.

The information we now possess is most precise, and the identification of the heights of Nebo appears not to be disputed. Professor Paine, however, goes further; he attempts to locate all the positions about Nebo spoken of in the Bible, and in doing so, I think he reads the poetical allusions too literally and rigidly.

For example (Deut. xxxiv. 1–4), a description is given of the view which Moses was given of the land from Nebo, in which it is stated that he was shown all the land of Judah to the utmost sea. Now it is physically impossible that any man under ordinary circumstances could literally see this view from any hills or mountains to the east of Jordan. It is therefore evident that the view given to Moses cannot be seen again by any human being under ordinary circumstances, and therefore it is quite useless to attempt to do more than ascertain that the view from Nebo is generally in accordance with the account given. The exact spot cannot be ascertained from the verses mentioned. Professor Paine, by arguing from these verses and others, would place Baal Peor at the ruins of Nebo, and Pisgah on the hill adjoining, far below (about 1000 feet) the height of Nebo. In this I do not concur. I consider Pisgah to be the opposite and northern hill or height enclosing Ayun Musa, Nebo being to south: that the name still exists I contend, in the name Mushkar, which belongs to this hill, and that the traditional site of the tomb of Moses is to be found in Kubr en Nebi-'Abdullah.

These detailed identifications cannot, however, be insisted on for the present very strongly; but it is desirable that when opposite views exist they should be stated, as nothing stirs up examination of a place so much as the knowledge that there is a controversy on the subject, that parties are interested in further light being thrown, and that the information given will be read, or at least skimmed over.

The Rev. G. Williams, B.D., Hon. Canon of Winchester, and Vicar of Ringwood, Hants.

In the subdivision of the large and intensely interesting subject which is occupying us this evening, I have had assigned to me the province of Jerusalem Topography; and in the twenty minutes allotted to me I cannot hope to contribute anything new in this field of research, unless I limit myself strictly to one or two particular points in the discussion; and even so I can hardly expect to make myself intelligible, unaided by plans and diagrams, the exhibition of which would be wholly unsuited to such an occasion as the present.

I purpose to confine myself entirely to the two main features in the Topography of Jerusalem—to wit, the site of the Jewish Temple, and of the Holy Sepulchre; and my endeavour shall be to show, as clearly as I can, how far the authority or authenticity of those sites is affected by recent explorations and discoveries; especially those undertaken by Captain Warren and Lieutenant Conder, under the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund. I must of necessity take for granted some knowledge of the general contour of Jerusalem, and some acquaintance with the questions at issue.

One remark, almost equally applicable to the two sites, I must offer at the outset; and it is this—that the historical evidence for both, into which, of course, I cannot here enter, is so full and complete, that it would require a vast amount of counter-evidence to discredit the authenticity of either. But this is not forthcoming. On the contrary, while the counter-theories are based entirely on pure assumptions, on fanciful conjectures, and groundless surmises, whatever proof has been hitherto dug up from the *débris* of the city—scanty and fragmentary at the best, and often of a merely negative character—is yet strongly confirmatory of the ancient traditions, authenticated as they are alike by civil and ecclesiastical writers.

1. *The Jewish Temple.*—The Temple, Josephus tells us, was situated on a strong hill. The sanctuary and altar, he further says, occupied a small level space on the summit of this hill; a space so restricted, that it scarcely sufficed for the sacred building, small as we know that was. The rocky ground fell away steep and abrupt from that highest summit into the deep valleys on either side.

The site now occupied by the Dome of the Rock is the comparatively level summit of what is universally regarded as the Temple-Mount. But we look in vain *on the surface* of the ground for the steep and abrupt fall of the hill described by Josephus. On the contrary, the whole enclosure of the Haram, as it is called, is comparatively level, if we except the raised platform on which stands the graceful "Dome of the Rock," covering the shapeless mass of natural rock from which the building takes its name.* It was not until the Royal Engineers attached to our Palestine Exploration brought to bear upon this sacred enclosure and its environs the instruments of their craft—sinking their shafts here, driving their galleries there, burrowing into holes and crannies which a fox might have declined to explore, navigating the unfathomed depths of unsavoury sewers on the frail raft of a slimy plank, or climbing up impossible funnels on rickety ladders, supported only by a projecting fragment of friable shingle, while, perhaps, a huge boulder of loose rock hung ominously overhead—it was not, I say, until these and many similar perils had been encountered, these difficulties surmounted, that it was discovered that this now smooth and level surface does, in fact, conceal that steep and rugged ridge of natural rock described by Josephus as artificially expanded and enlarged by successive kings, from the time of Solomon onwards, until it reached the dimensions requisite for the erection of the many mansions and their surrounding courts, of which Solomon's temple and altar were but the germ and nucleus. The result is to prove that the

* The top of this rock is some twenty feet higher than the general level of the outer court of the Haram.

sacred rock of the Moslems occupies a situation precisely analogous to the traditionary threshing-floors of Syria and Palestine, as seen by the traveller at the present day, viz., on the breezy summit of some rocky ridge, where the winnowing operation, executed by the forces of nature, without any mechanical appliances, immediately succeeds the threshing, which last process is still carried on, as in olden time, by "a sharp instrument having teeth," or by the treading of oxen and of other cattle.

Now, when it is remembered that the site divinely determined for the Altar and Temple was the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, and that there is within the Haram enclosure no other level space at all suited for a threshing-floor, I know not what further evidence can be required that the traditional site is the true one.

In any case, I apprehend that one result of the recent discoveries, which have restored to us the natural configuration of the Temple Mount, must be to explode for ever a counter-theory, which assigns to the Temple and its courts a position in the south-west angle of the Haram enclosure, where the natural rock, falling steeply towards the valley of Tyropœon on the west, has a depression of from 100 to 150 feet below the summit of the ridge, the ground being raised to its present level by made earth.

I have spoken of the artificial enlargement of the Temple area. This was, Josephus tells us, the work of long ages and of successive kings, on which all the sacred treasures were exhausted. We may well believe it, with the result of recent explorations before us; for they prove that the mechanical contrivances by which this unpromising site was developed into its present form were not uniform, but varied according to the progress of engineering science. Massive walls, constructed of cyclopean stones, built up from the shelving sides of the ridge to a height of some 200 feet, and then filled in with earth, was the earliest and rudest form of embankment as described by Josephus; but in process of time these primitive earthworks gave place to artistically-constructed vaults, which underlie great part of the area in various parts, especially towards the south-east angle, in what are popularly known as the Stables of Solomon.

Of these vast substructions I have something to say, and am glad to avail myself of this opportunity of correcting in the most public manner the only *serious* error which I have at present detected in my Topographical Notices of Jerusalem published some thirty years ago, while the study was still in its infancy, and we were all groping in the dark, speculating, as it has since been proved, on problems, the solution of which was concealed by the accumulation of *débris* overlying the original rock for some 130 feet or more.

The extension of the Temple area to the south by Herod the Great, and the erection of his royal cloister or portico on the south wall, was supposed by Professor Willis and others to have left their traces in that vast substruction of which I have just spoken, which he took to have been in its original design — however subsequently reconstructed—the undercroft of Herod's magnificent cloister. My difficulty in accepting this conclusion was twofold. There was, so far as I was aware, no evidence to be found in the vaults of any masonry earlier than Saracenic times, and no traces of a city wall having run into the Haram wall at the south-east angle, as the wall of Ophel must have done had this been the angle of the Temple area. The former of these two difficulties had been already

removed by the discovery, by the Count de Vogüé, of faint but sufficient indications of Herodian masonry in the substructions, before the wholly unexpected discovery of the wall of Ophel, proved to demonstration that the Temple area was conterminous with the existing Mosk enclosure in this quarter.

This discovery, the result of a happy accident, is one of the most important hitherto made for the elucidation of the topography of Ancient Jerusalem. It was made in sinking a shaft thirty-seven feet south of the south-east angle of the Haram wall, which here towers aloft to the height of some eighty-six feet. The top of the Ophel wall was found only four feet below the present surface of the ground; and what was once its height, but is now its depth, was found to be fifty-three feet to the rock. It was traced for a distance of about 800 feet in a south and south-westerly direction, and for twenty-four feet its course was occupied by a massive tower.

If this result of the survey has been to correct one important error in my Restoration of Jerusalem, other of its results have tended very much to corroborate and confirm theories of scarcely less importance.

The spring-course of an enormous arch, jutting out of the western wall of the Haram, not far from its south-west angle, had for some time attracted the attention of various travellers, when Dr Robinson, in his justly renowned "Biblical Researches," started the theory that this was a fragment of the ancient Bridge often mentioned by Josephus, from the time of Pompey down to the destruction of the city by Titus, as spanning the valley of the Tyropœon and joining the Temple Mount to the Upper City; and in this theory I was fain to acquiesce during my residence at Jerusalem. More mature reflection, however, and a wider and deeper study of the topographical notes of the Jewish historian, convinced me that this was a case of mistaken identity, and I proposed to transfer the Bridge to a point further to the north, *i.e.*, higher up the valley, where it is crossed by an embankment, traversed by one of the main streets of Jerusalem, called David Street, running from west to east, and leading from the Bazaars to the Haram. This embankment had somehow escaped the observation of Dr Robinson; and when I pointed it out as the representative of Josephus's Bridge, he boldly challenged its very existence. Our Officers of Engineers came with their sappers and miners, and made short work of Dr Robinson's Bridge, though they had no difficulty in restoring or completing the arch itself, for the opposite pier was there *in situ*, and the voussoirs of the fallen arch might have been readjusted in their places. The width of the arch was found to be 50 feet, its span 41 feet 6 inches. But the opposite ridge of Sion, which is here precipitous, is some 350 feet from the Haram wall, and rises much higher than the arch, so that it would have required many arches to span the valley and reach the opposite height.

Our Engineers deserve great credit for the labour which they bestowed upon the determination of this most important question. "Seven shafts were sunk in a line east and west across the Tyropœon Valley, opposite to Robinson's arch, in order to ascertain the nature of the valley, and search for the remains of the ancient viaduct." In the minute details of those shafts I find nothing that looks like a fragment of that massive Bridge, which must have left some substantial memorials behind. The

arch was no doubt a *ramp*, as engineers term it—an ascent, *i.e.*, by steps or otherwise—to give access to the royal portico of Herod from the valley of the Tyropœon.

Meanwhile my counter-theory of the situation of the Bridge had received most gratifying confirmation in the discovery—first by Dr Barclay, then by Captain Wilson—of a vast arch, still entire, and much resembling, both in its dimensions and in its construction, what Robinson's arch must have been, underlying the eastern end of the causeway, and springing out of the Haram wall, as does also the other arch. This discovery convinced me that the Bridge was still to be found under the superincumbent mass of *débris* which had converted it into a causeway, and I begged that the officer then in charge of the works might be instructed to probe the western side of the arch. This was done after some delay, and with a result which exceeded my most sanguine expectations. The arched Bridge was found to remain entire, and by its side is carried a secret passage, which served, no doubt, for a private communication between the Temple Mount and the Upper City.

The construction of the newly-discovered part of the Bridge differs wholly from that of the eastermost arch, which is double its width, and more than double the span of those of the more western portion. I think I can account for this difference.

When Pompey was approaching the city with hostile intentions, the partisans of Aristobulus withdrew from the faction of Hyrcanus, and having retired into the Temple, broke down the Bridge which connected it with the city. They could not have destroyed it utterly, for while their purpose of isolating the Temple would have been sufficiently attained by the demolition of a few of the easternmost arches, the opposite faction, in possession of the Upper City, would have prevented them from inflicting serious damage on the part of the Bridge which was commanded by their missiles. The ruined arches were no doubt rebuilt by Herod the Great, in connection with his great works about the Temple, on a larger scale, and in a more solid and substantial style, which seems to have necessitated an enlargement of the old Bridge, of which the indications may still be traced. This much must suffice for the Temple area.

2. The Holy Sepulchre may be dismissed in very few words, not because it involves questions of inferior interest to the subject which has hitherto occupied us, but because our explorers have occupied themselves almost exclusively with Hebrew antiquities; and besides, the evidence they have furnished on the Holy Sepulchre is almost entirely of a negative character. The state of the question is well and fairly put by Captain Wilson in "The Recovery of Jerusalem," p. 10:—

"The solution of this difficult question"—the authenticity of the present site—"depends on the course of the second wall which surrounded the [western part of the] city; if it ran to the east of the Church, there is no reason why the present tradition should not be correct; if it ran to the west, the tradition must be wrong." He adds, "Up to the present time no one has seen any portion of this wall."

I am disposed to demur to this unqualified statement in favour of a venerable fragment of wall in a line parallel with the street of the Bazaars, described and figured by the Count de Vogüé (p. 118, Views 50 and 51), and which he identifies with the second wall. But, to let that

pass, the surveyors met with insuperable difficulties in exploring along the line indicated; but they did the next best thing. They carried on extensive operations in a parcel of open ground called the Muristan. "Our object was," says Captain Warren, "to cut from north to south across the vacant space in search of any signs of the second wall, and accordingly shafts were sunk in line, and afterwards joined by trenches. The trench from north to south was 350 feet long, 25 feet deep on an average, and at about 200 feet distance from the Bazaar. At two points at the southern end, shafts 40 feet deep were sunk without finding rock. . . . The general result was unsatisfactory" ("Recovery of Jerusalem," p. 271).

There is nothing then in this to discredit the actual site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and therefore a tradition so venerable and well authenticated must be allowed to hold its own until some more valid reasons can be shown than have yet appeared for setting it aside. As for all counter theories, which have attempted to find another site, whether for the Holy Sepulchre or for the Temple, I have no hesitation, after careful and renewed study of the questions, in pronouncing them, one and all, utterly worthless.

I do not pretend to be indifferent to the issues of these archæological and topographical questions. The true site of the "holy and beautiful house," in which alone for upwards of a thousand years God was worshipped with an acceptable worship, cannot but be a matter of deep interest to those who have inherited the privileges and prerogatives of God's ancient people, "whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever;" while the rock-hewn tomb, in which lay the Body of that humanity anointed with Deity, in which our blessed Saviour had wrought out eternal redemption for us on the Cross of Calvary, must ever be regarded with deepest veneration by all succeeding generations, as it has been uninterruptedly for more than 1500 years by devout believers from every nation under heaven. That "Martyry of the Resurrection," which was the title by which the ancients delighted to honour it, may still retain its place in the affections of the English Churchman, as part of his Catholic inheritance from undivided Christendom. And should it ever be proved that the exigencies of truth demand the surrender of the cherished belief, surrendered it shall be, and that unreservedly, though not without a pang of fond regret, for the "demptus per vim mentis gratissimus error."

SUMMARY OF PAPER.

By the Rev. H. B. Tristram, LL.D., F.R.S.,
Canon of Durham.

Moab, though not part of the Land of Promise, is nevertheless a Bible land; yet till recently its soil had scarcely been trodden by an European, since the fall of the Roman Empire. The Crusaders, it is true, held the fortress of Kerak in the south, but they reached it by the southern route, and penetrated no further northward. In the north-east I have gazed on a vast palace, probably Persian, so beautiful, elaborate, and unique in its architecture, that it is impossible it can ever have been seen by civilised

man since the Saracen inroad and have remained unknown, yet it is nameless, and without tradition attaching. The discovery of the famous Moabite Stone by the Rev. F. Klein at length attracted attention to the country. In that stone we have a witness older than the slabs of Nineveh, a witness in presence of which most of the coins and manuscripts and inscriptions of antiquity are comparatively young, which has come forth from the depths of past centuries to give its testimony to the truth of the Bible record, with a distinctness, a copiousness, and a particularity which render it unspeakably valuable, and engraved, too, in characters which are probably the very forms of the letters in which, 500 years before, the Pentateuch itself had been penned.

It could not be reasonably anticipated that any similar or coeval stones still remained aboveground. But the discovery at least showed that Moab was not, as it had been assumed, a desolate tract, without a feature of interest on its surface. Professor Palmer and Mr Tyrwhitt Drake made a hurried journey on foot from south to north in 1871, and in the following year a party, of whom I was one, visited the country more leisurely. The result of our investigations is, that there is hardly a case in which the sacred history impinges on that of Moab, with the exception of the early invasion of Eglon, soon after the conquest, in which the inspired record is not more or less illustrated by present facts. The glowing prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the allusions of Amos and Zephaniah, the story of the wars of Sihon, of Jephthah, and of Joab, must ever be read with deepened interest by those who have noted their marvellous coincidence with the state of the country as we now see it.

The first notice of the land of Moab is the allusion in the history of the raid of Chedorlaomer upon the primeval inhabitants, the earliest organised invasion on record: where we are told that Chedorlaomer defeated the *Rephaim*, the *Zuzim*, and the *Emim* in Ashteroth Karnaim, Ham, and Shaveh Kiriathaim. Along with these are named here, as also in Deut. ii. 10, the Horites in Mount Seir. The names of the two latter sites, Ham and Kiriathaim, yet linger in central and southern Moab; the former, Ashteroth Karnaim, is with reason fixed farther north. About the locality of the Horites there is no question. Now almost the only clue which we have to the distinctions of primæval races is supplied by their varying modes of sepulture. We have here four distinct tribes named anterior to the Amorite and Moabite occupation. The term Horites signifies "cave-men," and we have abundant evidence of cave-dwellers in Mount Seir and the country south. In Moab we have no traces of "cave-men," but we have three distinct modes of burial in different parts of the country, corresponding to the locations of the three races of giants. We have cairns to the south and east, dolmens in the north-west, and stone circles like those of the Druids farther north. I found no argument on this. I merely adduce it as an example of the perfect harmony of the record with existing facts.

Next succeeded the Amorites, who, having first occupied the east, succeeded under Sihon in ejecting the Moabites from the region north of Arnon. This is mentioned in almost the earliest national song extant (Numb. xxi.) But Sihon's triumph was short-lived. In the battle of Jahaz, Israel won the whole of his territory. Josephus gives us details of the battle which correspond minutely with the topography. The battle-field is unquestioned, on the slopes of the hill which still bears the name of Shihan. Josephus

relates how the Amorites were soon driven to take refuge behind the walls, from whence they were driven by the slings and arrows of the Israelites to rush down the ravine of the Arnon for water. All the south-eastern slope of Shihan is covered with the remains of a network of Cyclopean walls, differing in character from those of later date; and driven from these, a flight of two miles would bring them to the edge of the tremendous gorge of the Arnon. Every detail of the battle can be recognised on the spot.

An examination of the country enables us to trace with minute accuracy Balaam's progress. Balak meets the prophet at the banks of the Arnon, the frontier of his kingdom. Then he takes him to Kirjath Huzoth, identified by the Targum with Kiriathaim (Kureituu), and its high place, *i.e.*, Jebel Attarus, at the foot of which are the ruins of Kiriathaim, and which is the first conspicuous eminence north of the Arnon. The next day he goes on to the high places of Baal, *i.e.*, Baal-Meon or Main, the second position, whence he had a commanding view of the future country of Israel. Afterwards they proceed to Pisgah or Nebo, and finally to the top of Peor facing Jeshimon, *i.e.*, the ridge north of Nebo, and due west of Heshbon, where there are a group of ruins and a full view of the plains of Shittim. I conceive it impossible, when on the spot, not to recognise the four sacrificial stations, or to suppose the account to have been written by one unfamiliar with the country.

The persistency of the names of towns and districts is noteworthy. There is one peculiarity in the Moabite nomenclature, viz., that so many of the names have a dual termination. Now the character of Moab when we have left the edge of the ridge is an upland plain, covered with low mounds which are often in groups. Many of the towns are built on two mounds, surrounded by a common wall, and Professor Palmer discovered that in the provincial vocabulary the name *harith* is given to these mounds—the very word which occurs in *Kir-harosheth* or *heres*—and of the meaning of which we were ignorant. When we see the two hills of both the Kiriathaims we at once appreciate the force of the termination.

I may mention one interesting case of persistency in a name. We had been examining Aroer and Dibon. When riding due east, we found ourselves in a long sloping depression, with grass-grown ridges running across it every few hundred yards up the hillsides. We could get no explanation of the meaning of these ridges, but were simply told we were in the "Derb Kurn Dhiban," the way of the vineyards of Dibon. The valley was about three miles long. Probably none of the Arabs ever saw a vine, and there remains not one in the country. But we could see at once that these grass-grown dykes were stone heaps, such as those on which the vine is to-day trailed on the slopes of Hermon and Lebanon; and when we turn to Judges, we read that Jephthah "pursued the Ammonites from Aroer unto the plain of the vineyards." Now, this was exactly the route which a defeated army from the east would take in its retreat, and the name remains in another language, identical in signification.

Of the eighteen towns mentioned on the stone of Mesha, fourteen occur in Scripture, and can be identified in the modern vernacular. These were all examined by our party. One—Horonaim—occurs both on the stone and in the Bible, and is not yet recovered, but we can infer that it was on the frontier of Edom, which has not yet been thoroughly explored; and three

others are unknown or only doubtfully identified. Of the names hitherto regarded as lost, which occur in the Old Testament, several, such as Dimon, were met with by us.

The fruits and the vines of Moab are repeatedly mentioned; of these not a trace remains in the upper country. A few old almond-trees on Attarus are the only relics. Yet we have evidence of its former state, not only in the traces of vineyards, as near Dibon, but in the wine-presses, and especially in the oil-presses, with their great stones like huge mill-stones, to be found among the heaps of nearly every city. It is scarcely necessary that I should add, that with the single exception of Kerak, there remains not a town inhabited in the whole country. With the extermination of the settled population the fruit-trees would perish, and with their destruction the rains become uncertain. We may understand the desolation caused by the destruction of the wells (2 Kings iii.) when we notice that on the cistern-supply Moab must have been absolutely dependent; for its only rivers, as the Arnon and Callirrhoe, are in deep gorges, and wholly useless for irrigation. No wonder, then, that the great feature of the country are its hollowed cisterns. These form a perfect labyrinth under every mound, and in number and capacity far exceed even those of southern Judæa, while they give clear evidence of the enormous population the rich soil was enabled to maintain. Terrace-cultivation, excepting on the steep descent to the Dead Sea, there was none, the country having much greater natural fertility than western Palestine, but no natural fortresses except Kir, a place absolutely impregnable under the conditions of ancient warfare, and which the forces of Israel and Jehoshaphat could only annoy by their slingers, and then raise the siege.

One of the most interesting, yet the most utterly ruined, of all the sites in Moab is Machærus, connected with Scripture history as the scene of the martyrdom of John the Baptist. The Roman army under Bassus fearfully avenged the desperate resistance of the last remnant of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, and by the expenditure of enormous labour have heaped all the stones of the city into one huge cairn. They have left, however, the foundations of the citadel level with the soil, and in that citadel, Josephus tells us, Herod had his palace. A deep well, a very large, vaulted cistern, with roof still intact, and, most interesting of all, two dungeons, one of which may probably have been the prison-house of the Baptist, are the only remains within the keep.

The identification of Nebo can scarcely be called very recent, the place having been visited and recognised independently by the Duc de Luynes and myself, within the space of ten days, in the spring of 1864. The name Nebbeh remains, though Pisgah seems to be lost, or rather transferred, under its Arabic form, Feshkhah, to the opposite headland on the west of the Dead Sea. The view harmonises with that described in Deuteronomy. The Plain of Shittim, where Israel was encamped, is spread out like a map at our feet. The lower course of the Jordan and its mouth, together with its plain, is open to the view as far as opposite Shechem, and the whole of western Palestine from south of Hebron, Judæa, the heights of Benjamin, the hills of Samaria, all as far as Carmel and the Plain of Esdraelon.

Just in front of Nebo, on the lower ledge overlooking the Dead Sea,

are the ruins of an ancient city, with remains of temples and of Christian churches, showing that it was inhabited to the time of the Saracenic invasion, which is by some given as Shia'gha, by others, Ziagha or Ziara. In this place, I believe, I have recognised Zoar, which we know was an Episcopal city in the time of Eusebius. The position exactly harmonises with the mention of Zoar in Moses' Pisgah view. After Jericho, the ruins are the nearest feature in the landscape, directly in front, perched on a low brow, almost in a line with Jericho, and the object on which the eye would naturally rest in its survey next after the Jordan Plain. This site, likewise, meets more closely than any other the conditions for the position of Zoar as given in the story of Lot; assuming, as I think on all considerations we fairly may, that the doomed cities were in the Plain of Jordan, north of the Dead Sea.

There is yet something to be accomplished in Moab. The south-east of the country has not been carefully examined; and it is to be regretted that the American exploration has not as yet accomplished any results; but we may expect that, with efficient explorers, such as have now gone out, fresh light will be cast on the sacred records, as well as on the later history of the country. For the present, the state of Moab is exactly as foretold by Zephaniah, a breeding of nettles and a perpetual desolation, and the men of the east possess it, *i.e.*, the Bedouin, such as the Beni Sakk'r and 'Anizeh, who, emerging from their eastern fortresses, annually depasture it.

If we can expect no further light to be cast upon Scripture history by new Moabite stones, a series of discoveries, of which we can scarcely yet guess the importance, promises to carry back the province of historical criticism to the epoch of the Flood. The brilliant discoveries of Botta, Layard, Rawlinson, and others, more than twenty years ago, had supplied a contemporary commentary on the Books of Kings and Chronicles; and now the clay tablets of Kouyunjik, read, and many of them exhumed, by the learning and marvellous acumen of Mr G. Smith, from the library of Sennacherib, are spanning the chasm of centuries farther back. It is true that the tablets of Assyria are two or three hundred years later than the Moabite Stone, or about B.C. 660; but Mr Smith has shown that they bear intrinsic evidence of being copies of documents of incalculably greater antiquity. This is especially the case with the Deluge tradition, of which there are now three copies, presenting various readings. Some of the characters in the original documents were of an ancient type, and as the Assyrian copyist did not always know their representatives in his own time, he has left some of them in their original form. There are, besides, sentences which have been originally side glosses, which have crept into the text. Assyrian scholars tell us, too, that the language is peculiar and archaic when compared with the Assyrian of the historic epoch.

If, notwithstanding all this, we had found an identity with the Scriptural account, it might have been argued that Moses, or perhaps Abraham, had obtained their story from the myths of Chaldea—the cradle of their race; that here we had the source of the Pentateuch. I say nothing of the difficulties in which this theory must involve us, to account for Moses, learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians, seizing upon Chaldean traditions. But when, instead of identity, we find a constant difference

between the two accounts, while the events narrated in both are the same, and occur in the same order, it is impossible to evade the conclusion that they are distinct records of one event. The minor differences bespeak an independent tradition. The Biblical account is that of an inland people, the tablet of a maritime. The ark is called a ship; it is launched, it sails on the sea, and has a pilot. While both accounts make the Deluge to be a Divine punishment for the wickedness of the world, the one recognises God alone, the other brings in in various ways all the principal deities of the Assyrian Pantheon; *both* mention the altar on the summit of the mountain after quitting the ark, and *both* the sacrifices by *sevens*. There are differences as to the duration of the flood, but probably none as to the place where the ark rested; for the peak we call Ararat, the *Nizir* of the tablet, really lay east of Assyria.

It is too soon to ask what has been *proved*. At least a new field of inquiry and discovery in the early part of the Bible history is opened out to us. Who, a century ago, could have dreamed that a contemporary history of the wars of Assyria, Babylon, and Israel would be restored to us? To-day that period is modern to the Semitic scholar, as he collates the various readings of a language archaic in the days of Jehoshaphat, and as he sifts the legends of the Flood. May it not be that in that cradle of civilisation still lie the histories which the Assyrians copied 2500 years ago, and that among them may be tablets which shall cast light on the dispersion—on the antediluvian Eden itself? At least, while a speculative criticism, and the inner consciousness, and an oracular Matthew Arnold have been making free with the later books, historical and geographical research have been building an impregnable fortress of facts round the earlier books of the Bible.

The President.

It is not the custom at these Congresses to propose any vote of thanks, but I am sure you will all agree in carrying by acclamation a vote of thanks to those persons who have come together to-night to give us so much valuable instruction upon the land which above all others is the object of our highest interest. We have been revelling in the pleasures of memory; let us spend a few moments in thinking of the pleasures of hope. The second speaker said, and said with truth, that the Promised Land is still a Land of Promise. Our hearts assent to that; let our prayers be offered up, from our hearts, that that promise, in God's own time, may be fulfilled. We know what that promise is, that though God has scattered the Jews among all lands, from them will He bring them back. That He has scattered the Jews among all lands, I can bear witness; because amongst the first subscribers to the first church in New Zealand were three of the Jewish community. That God will bring them back, my own experience has convinced me; for there, too, in that distant land I had the inestimable privilege of grafting into the Church of Christ one of those whom St Paul has foretold should be grafted on to it. It was a mother married to a Christian, who in teaching her children the Holy Scriptures, became herself converted. Now, dear friends, we have to think of this great object of interest which is open to us for the future. It is to pray God to have mercy upon all these children of Israel whom

He has scattered in other lands, to bring them back to their own country, that country which Abraham looked into, into houses built with the hand of God Himself, into that city which has foundations, whose builder is God. It may be a distant hope; so was it a distant hope when that aged man waited for the consolation of Israel in the temple of Jerusalem. And though the hope be one that maketh the heart sick, though it be long deferred, yet it is a hope which rests upon the promise of a God that cannot fail. It is that God who has declared that in Him and in His Blessed Son shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, who is the God both of the Jew and the Gentile. It needs for us no special vision from heaven to convince us, as it convinced St Peter, that salvation was for the Gentiles, and not for the Jews alone. God forbid that we should ever think that the Jews are cast out from the hope of salvation, seeing that God has included all the nations of the earth. Let this then be our hope and our abiding prayer, bearing in mind continually that without this we cannot be made free; our own salvation cannot be completed until Jew and Gentile from every nation under heaven, from the north, from the south, from the east, and from the west, shall come into that Kingdom of Christ which shall extend over the whole earth until the day shall come when He shall be surrendered to His Father, that God may be all in all.

THURSDAY EVENING, 7th OCTOBER.

The Bishop of Blomfontein took the Chair at Seven o'Clock.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES.

PAPERS.

The Rev. Henry Brass, M.A., Incumbent of St Matthew's, Redhill, Surrey.

"Feed my Lambs" was one of the last commands of our risen Lord, a proof of love to Him who took the little ones in His arms and blessed them. And as the faithful Pastor looks upon the young of his flock, and thinks how many are likely to stray from the fold, or knows by painful experience how few of the Children in his Schools become regular attendants on the means of grace, it becomes a matter of increasing anxiety how he can best carry out the responsibility laid upon him.

Of course he must not forget the real root of the evil—the corrupt nature of all Adam's children. "The carnal mind is enmity against God," and therefore, unless influenced by the grace of God, they will be only too glad to escape from the restraints of true religion. But still, when, perchance, his eye lights upon the children's gallery, and he sees some sleepy

and uninterested, others restless and fidgety, with difficulty kept in order through a tedious service, he cannot but *have serious misgivings* as to whether he has been acting *wisely* in compelling their attendance at the long Morning Service, and whether he ought not to make some new and special effort to interest the young in our Church Service.

But where is he to look for assistance? What provision has our Prayer-Book made? Almost none! with the exception of a rubric directing the Curate to catechise so many of the Children of his parish as shall be sent unto him, and that god-parents are to "call upon them to hear Sermons," the presence of Children in public worship seems entirely overlooked! No Liturgies, no Hymns, and, indeed, for their instruction there is no elementary Catechism, only a short "Catechism to be learned of every person before he be confirmed," and nothing to supply the larger Catechism for young persons put forth in the reign of Edward VI.

He naturally looks to *Convocation* to supply the deficiency, but the claims of some two or three million children have not apparently been weighty enough to appear on the "gravamina" of that august body, unless indeed we may count as an exception the fact, that for several sessions it seriously debated the question whether a father might stand godfather for his own child!

The Clergyman is therefore obliged to act for himself. Shall he revive the almost obsolete rubric of catechising the Children in the midst of the Evening Service? By all means let him try. Catechising is a most valuable art, which the clergy will do well to cultivate. But at the same time there are *practical* difficulties not a few. To catechise well in public is no easy matter; it has been said that "a fool may *preach*, but it requires a giant to *catechise*"! and if badly done, I fear but few of the Children will be "*sent* to him," and he may get some quiet hints from the Congregation that he had better drop it. Besides, the *Evening* Service is not the best suited for children, and it is not easy to secure all the front seats. It makes the service too long, especially if there are Baptisms, which are also to take place after the Second Lesson, and the Congregation would hardly like to give up their evening sermon for the sake of listening to the catechising. An *Afternoon* Service, if there be one, is much more suitable, but then care must be taken that we do not clash with the Sunday School.

It has been the fashion of late to disparage Sunday Schools and underrate their importance. But whatever *theoretical* objections may be urged, the *Sunday School is an established fact*, one of the institutions of the land, and one which suits parents of the working classes. And if any clergyman neglect to gather the children, there are *others* ready enough to get hold of them, and they will be lost to the Church. We do not pay half enough attention to this subject. The numbers in every Church Sunday School ought to exceed those in the Day School (in my own it does so by some thirty or forty per cent.), because we retain children who have left the day school, or who go to private schools during the week. Besides being a great help to the Clergyman, the Sunday School has this immense advantage, that it enlists the personal services of the Laity, and their interest in the work of the Church—and this is no light matter. It will not do, then, to *substitute* Catechising for Sunday Schools; at the same time, it

might be well to catechise in the Church children of the upper and middle classes who do not go to the school.

By pretty general consent we have to fall back upon *Special Services for Children.*

These let us for the sake of clearness divide into *School-room, Church,* and *Mission Services.*

I. *School-room Services.*—The too common practice has been—after an hour or an hour and a half of morning School to send all the Children to Church, pack them into a gallery or remote corner, where they can neither see nor hear well, and make them undergo a long Service which was not made for them, and a Sermon they cannot understand! How, in the name of common sense, can we expect children to *love* attendance at Church? But what *are* we to do with them? Some cut the knot of difficulty by dismissing them immediately after morning school to play about the streets, or go birds-nesting, or otherwise get into mischief, for the parents don't want them at home in the way of cooking the Sunday dinner, and will very likely send them to a *chapel* school, where they will be taken care of till dinner time!

Far better (1.) To shorten morning school so as not to take all the freshness out of the children. (2.) To let only the elder or selected children go to Church, and if possible sit with parents, friends, or teachers. And if the Morning Service be shortened (as the recent Act permits), so much the better for the children and adults also. And (3.) have a service for the younger Children in the School-room or some other building. If the clerical staff will admit, let a Clergyman conduct it, and it will be more like Church; if not, the Superintendent or one of the *best* teachers. It is found better to let the same person always superintend, though the address may be given by others. (Many laymen have a special talent for addressing children.) When morning school is over, if possible, change the room, for children *like variety;* or while seats are being arranged, let them take a short walk, or march for five or ten minutes round the playground, to air the room and the Children's attention! Have plenty of singing and chanting; use some of the Church prayers, or the shortened form of Service, or a School-room liturgy, explaining every now and then the meaning, teaching them to respond properly, and training them to take their part in the Service at Church, which should always be held up as *the* thing as a treat for those who behave best or respond best. Give a lively address, catechetical, if possible, and full of anecdote or illustration; introduce a hymn now and then, if attention at all flags.

The experience of one of the most successful conductors of Children's Services is, that it is *monotony* rather than length which tires the young, and that they will keep up their attention a long while if you only give them sufficient variety. With a Service like the above the Children will not leave too fatigued, nor get home too early for the Sunday dinner.

Some strongly advocate also an Evening service, at which of course attendance would be voluntary. For *where* are the Children in the evening? not in Church, not at home unless it be very wet. Satan will surely find mischief for idle hands to do. If you make your Service attractive the young will come, and prove by their presence that they have not had too much of it already. Two or three neighbouring parishes might unite in a Service of this kind!

II. *Services in Church.*—These, for reasons I have given, can only be occasional. May I be allowed to mention my own plan, though I do not profess that it is the best, or suited to every parish. On the afternoon of the first Sunday in the month, all the front seats in Church are reserved for the School Children, who sit in classes with their teachers (or parents by previous arrangement). A Hymn, the Litany (all standing to chant the Gloria, partly as a *change* from kneeling, and also because standing, and not kneeling, is the most natural and becoming posture for singing), then a Hymn and Collect, and a catechetical Sermon with a Hymn or two suited to the subject introduced in the midst, then a concluding Hymn, prayer and Blessing, the whole lasting little more than an hour. This Service is very popular, children of the middle and upper classes, servants, and parents fill our large church to overflowing.

In Children's Services a twofold object must be kept in view—intelligible joyous worship, and instruction. The Service must be made as varied and attractive as possible, so that the idea of "Church" may be a pleasant and not a wearisome one; and to this end the Children must themselves have a large share—all must not be done *for* them by the Minister. The shortened form of Evening Prayer seems best, or the Litany; and I have met with several excellent liturgies compiled from the Book of Common Prayer, for the use of which the sanction of the Ordinary could no doubt be easily obtained.

But I have long felt that we ought to have *specially prepared and authorised Children's Liturgies.* Our Church prayers were evidently not compiled with a reference to children. No one can pretend that such sentences as "Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us in sundry places," &c., give expression to children's thoughts and ideas, or are likely to be popular with them. Prayers like this—"From all bad tempers, quarrelling and selfishness, from idleness, rudeness, and disobedience to our parents and teachers, good Lord, deliver us," would come much more *home* than "From all sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion, from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism, good Lord, deliver us."

Why should not Convocation take up a practical subject like this? With reference to *Singing* (a most important part of Children's Services, and one to which Nonconformists pay far more attention than we), there are many hymn-books, yet a good Children's Hymn Book of about a hundred or a hundred and fifty hymns, is still a desideratum; one on a broad basis, including modern popular hymns, only taking care to avoid on the one hand the forced experience of *some* of the Revival hymns, and on the other the insipid doggrel of too many of the metrical liturgies, or mild, pointless rhymes such as—

> "Mary was that mother mild,
> Jesus Christ her only child."

The *Music*, too, is almost as important as the words, and often tends to fix them on the memory and recall them in after years. The astonishing popularity of Sankey's tunes with children as well as adults may show us what a mistake is made by confining the young to stiff orthodox tunes, and considering rather our own correct taste than what tends to make singing hearty and joyous and profitable to them. Our Church has much yet to learn as to the hold which singing will give her on the rising generation.

And then for *Instruction*—The style should be simple, if possible catechetical, but certainly conversational, picturesque, studded with illustration and anecdote. Even those who cannot catechise may make the Children repeat the text, find out texts, and answer a question now and then. He who would successfully teach children must put himself in the child's place, and accustom himself to look at things from a child's standpoint. This is eminently the case with Mr Spiers, one of the most attractive *speakers*, and the Rev. J. Vaughan, of Brighton, one of the most striking *preachers* to children that I know.

Time forbids me to speak of Sermons to the Young, or do more than mention some of the best authors—Dr Newton of the American Episcopal Church, J. J. Bolton, W. Bruce, G. Calthorp, Martyn Hart, Todd's Lectures. For catechetical instruction—Malan's "Parables Explained," sundry Lessons by the Sunday School Institute. Stock's invaluable "Lessons on the Life of our Lord" are very suggestive.

Some advocate announcing the subject beforehand, others follow it up by encouraging the children to write out a sketch. But one thing is clear—Children's Services will be successful in proportion to the *care* and pains bestowed upon them.

III. *Mission Services.*—Here, of course, much discretion is required. But if adults need a Mission, why not children? Precisely the same reasons and the same objections apply to the one as the other. Besides careless and indifferent ones, who need to be aroused, are there not a large number of young people in our schools and congregations who, long under earnest faithful teaching, are impressed, but not decided for Christ, still halting between two opinions? A Mission is often the turning-point with such, by pressing on them the duty of at once deciding for Christ, and offering Him their heart's affections while in the bud of youth, instead of when faded and withered by long contact with the world. If we must all receive the kingdom of God as little children, who can doubt the possibility of the conversion of children, or that they are capable of believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, and enjoying all the benefits of His salvation? and if children are not saved, what is the use of all our labour? Ought we to be satisfied with letting them leave our schools still unconverted?—satisfied with the vague hope that *perhaps* the seed may one day spring up? Teachers, too, are stirred up by it to take a deeper interest in the salvation of the individual child.

A Mission in my own parish brought me several most satisfactory candidates for Confirmation, and the good impression produced by it has remained to this day, many dear little ones meeting together from time to time for prayer, praise, and instruction. If the Mission be well followed up by a course of regular instruction, a band of decided earnest children and young people may be brought under the more immediate influence of the Clergyman, and be a sort of nursery for future teachers and workers for Christ. But for information on these points, I would refer you to the publications of the Children's Special Service Mission.

In conclusion. Remember that the subject is a *vastly more important one* than I fear must have appeared to you from my desultory remarks. You *have the working classes of the future now under your influence.* Make the most of your golden opportunity. "Take heed that ye despise

not one of those little ones." Remember also that more effectual than any system, or any Services however carefully arranged, is the loving, prayerful *personal* intercourse of one who loves children *much*, but who loves *children's souls more.*

The Rev. George Everard, M.A., Vicar of St Mark's, Wolverhampton.

"The world is preserved by the breath of school children." A saying like this presents a truth worth remembering. The children of this generation are the parents of the next. Their influence reaches upwards and downwards. The father's heart has often been touched by a hymn sung by a little one. Many a godly mother, training her offspring in the fear of God, herself learnt the lesson in her earliest years.

Moreover, the young are a sacred deposit left by Christ to the care of His Church. "Feed My lambs." "Whosoever shall receive one such little child in My name receiveth Me." "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, shall in no wise lose his reward." Sayings like these indicate plainly the mind of Christ. They refer to the weak ones of the flock—and who are weaker than the young and inexperienced? The under-shepherd, like his Divine Master, ought to gather the lambs with his arm, and gently lead them by the still waters of heavenly love.

It is also to be remarked that the labourer in this harvest field will carry home the most precious sheaves. The memory receptive of truth, the heart open to the kindly word of the teacher, the conscience not yet seared by long contact with sin—all this gives good hope of blessed fruit to faithful toil in the instruction of the young.

Our Church system presents an additional reason for diligent labour in this field.

We present the little ones to Christ in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism: shall we leave them afterwards uncared for in the midst of the perils they must encounter?

We bid the parents and god-parents to call upon them to hear sermons —shall we not provide such as they shall be able to understand?

A promise is made on their behalf that they repent and believe; they are pledged to fight manfully under the banner of Christ against sin, the world, and the devil: should any effort then be spared that in due season they may fulfil these solemn engagements?

If the promises made on their behalf be not fulfilled, can we hope that the true grace of baptism is in the heart? The Scripture knows nothing of latent graces. The searching word of the apostle in his Epistle to the Romans is not limited to one ordinance or to one dispensation: "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly: and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

Again, we have the rite of Confirmation. We desire young persons to

come forward, earnestly and intelligently to take their places as members of Christ's Church. We ask them individually to utter the solemn words, "I do:" a promise, sincerely made, scarcely less than this: "I believe the blessed truths revealed in Holy Scripture and summed up in the Apostles' Creed: I trust in Christ, my only hope and Saviour: I yield myself to God, to serve Him faithfully all the days of my life."

But can we look for intelligent faith and obedience like this from a few weeks' preparation, unless previously the ground has been well tilled and the heavenly seed cast in?

Nor have we a less forcible argument in the Board School System, which is being so rapidly developed in our land.

In our large towns we have not the proportion of children in our National Schools that once we had, and in too many cases where they are taught elsewhere, the religious instruction, even where it is given, is scarcely worth the name.

Is this no reason why the Church should step in, and, by fresh efforts on the Sunday, or the week-day even, supply this great lack?

We must not—we dare not—leave the little ones without spiritual instruction. We must leave no effort untried—no stone unturned—to guide their youthful footsteps in the path of peace.

We must reckon it one of our plainest duties, by every possible means, to bring them and to keep them within the fold of the Good Shepherd.

Contrast for a moment two children:

Trace the course of one—neglected by parents who care not for their own spiritual welfare—lost sight of by Christ's Church—without a word of earnest counsel or advice—sinking ever into deeper and yet deeper depths—drawn into the vortex of surrounding iniquity—then in turn becoming a leader in evil to a generation following—spreading all around a pestilential influence—the effects of which God alone can measure.

Trace, on the other hand, the upward course of a child brought in by the agency of the Christian pastor—taught in the Word and receiving it—by the grace of God learning to resist temptation and rising above it—growing stronger in grace with advancing years—an example of the blessedness of God's service, and, by a lifetime of welldoing, proving to be as a bright candle shining in a dark world; as leaven in the midst of the lump; as a grain of God's salt in the midst of corruption.

But if it be above all things desirable to guide the young aright, how shall we accomplish it? What the mark we aim at? What the instrumentality employed?

Our aim must be nothing less than this—to bring home to the young heart the knowledge and love of God as revealed in His Son Jesus Christ. Here alone the mystery of life is solved, and peace and strength found in the dangerous paths they have to tread. "This is life eternal"—and it is a truth both for young and old—"to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou has sent."

To promote this, there must be diligent instruction in the Word. The lamp of truth needs to be placed in the hand of the young pilgrim, that, by its light, he may escape the pitfalls of error, unbelief, and sin. The trusty sword of the Spirit needs to be committed to him, and the youthful hand taught to wield it in the triple conflict he has to wage.

The Church of Rome teaches that women and children cannot under-

stand the Scriptures; not so the Apostle Paul—even with reference to the books of the Old Testament. Timothy is taught by his mother the lively oracles: "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

From the Word we must teach the little ones the true character of sin—what is sin—what its ingratitude—its folly—its baseness—its guilt—its peril for this life and the next. Very tenderly, as with a father's hand, we must lead them to the awful heights of Sinai. We must tell them of God's law in all its breadth and spirituality. We must tell them of the holiness, the justice, yea, and the severity of God. We must unfold the ten commandments by the light of Scripture narratives, the Sermon on the Mount, the apostolic epistles, and of the temptations which the young have daily to experience. Then, with all gentleness and affection, we must remind them that the soul that sinneth it shall die, and that God will by no means clear the guilty.

It is no slight gain for the conscience of a child to be in any measure enlightened. To know something of God's law and the deadly evil of sin is a step in the right direction. If not at the time, it may probably lead to a change hereafter. In a time of sickness and trouble, or through the preaching of the Word in later days, it is not unlikely that the foundation thus laid may issue in a true repentance and conversion of heart to God.

But shall we stop here? Shall we teach the little ones no higher lesson? Shall we instruct them as to their duty and their sin, and leave them without knowing the secret of strength to avoid the one and perform the other? Shall we not rather bring the children face to face with a loving Personal Friend and Saviour? Shall we not bring them straight to His footstool, to learn there something of His infinite kindness and compassion?

I fear that too often this has been withheld. Too often the only gospel for the young has been something of this kind: "Be obedient and dutiful to your parents. Be attentive and reverent in the house of God. Tell the truth and never swerve from it. Be diligent in your work at school, and do always what is right, and you shall have your reward in this life and the next." All excellent precepts in their place; very needful is it that the young should be reminded of them. But is Christ Himself to be kept in the background? Are they too young to see the King? Two years, for his sin, Absalom was forbidden to see the king's face; but what sin have the young committed that they may not see the King of Zion? May they never enter His palace and learn to know and love Him? Have they no sins from which He would cleanse their conscience? Have they no little sorrows and troubles which He would bear? Putting side by side, we may learn a lesson from two scenes—one in the law and the other in the gospel.

I turn to the mount which burned with fire. The lightning flashes, the thunder rolls, the flame on the summit is seen by all Israel. The whole mountain trembles at the manifest Presence of Jehovah. Around it bounds are set. No one dare approach or touch it. Of those many thousands of little ones under peril of death, not one must place his foot within the limits assigned.

I turn to another scene. Fifteen centuries have passed away, and the long-promised Messiah has come. Christ is beyond the Jordan; a few humble women are bringing their little ones to Him. Seldom is Christ angry, but He is displeased now, for the disciples would keep the children back. Nay, it must not be so. He kindly welcomes the faith of the mothers. His arms embrace their enfants, and His hand is lovingly placed on their heads. The word of invitation is spoken once for the encouragement of the young in all future ages: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Ah! Christ loves to be regarded as the children's friend. He delights to forgive and save them. He will wipe away the falling tear, and listen to the lisping prayer, and accept the hosanna of praise, and never, never despise the least that comes to Him.

Whatever else you forget, never forget to set Christ before the young, as the Saviour and the Friend they need. Tell them of Him as one who is meek and lowly in heart, as the Good Shepherd who carries the lambs in His bosom, as the mother-bird who gathers her brood beneath her wings and protects them from storm and cold. Sure I am that children of six, eight, and ten years, and even less, may have distinct experience of a Saviour's forgiving love; that the arms of the little ones may embrace Him, and the tendrils of young hearts twine around Him.

For the purpose of leading the young to the Saviour, and building them up in Him, children's services have been found very helpful. May it not be that our ordinary services have not only failed to profit our children, but have often been positively injurious? I fear that the weariness induced by long prayers, and a sermon not understood, has often made the church a place of bondage rather than of holy gladness, and has kept the school children in after days from ever entering within its doors. A thoughtful, prayerful child was overheard in prayer one Saturday evening to say, "O Lord, let the minister say something to-morrow that I can understand." Such was the petition that arose from the heart of this little one. It is a prayer that may do us good to remember. From time to time a few words dropped by the way for the young may prove not the least useful in the sermon.

But if such was the feeling of a child desirous of instruction, what would most probably be that of others? Ought we not to provide services in all respects likely to interest and benefit whatever children we may have under our care? I shall not enlarge on occasional efforts and missions for children. In many cases they are valuable, and are doing a blessed work. Words spoken by the seashore have raised up youthful witnesses for Christ in many an inland town. Services held by a stranger for children in a Town-hall have brought parents and children alike to the Saviour's footstool. But the whole value of such services depends, under God, as I believe, on the instruction that precedes and follows them. The ground needs to be prepared by the ploughshare of truth, and the young plants to be watered by the continuous teaching of the Word of Life.

"Unless those young shrubs are well watered they will all die"—a word spoken with reference to a newly-planted garden, seemed to my ear to have a second application, and to teach a lesson of deep moment to the Christian pastor.

Hence I prefer spending the time that remains on the more regular work that may be carried on amongst the young.

I may illustrate the work that may be done by a reference to my own parish :

Sunday mornings.—Two services for the young are being carried on during church-time—one for the younger children of the Sunday school, the other for the poorer children in another part of the parish.

Sunday afternoons.—Once a month a children's service is held in the church after half an hour's instruction given in the school. Three hymns, a portion of the Liturgy, an address of twenty minutes to half an hour, frequently catechetical, occupies less than an hour.

In some parishes it has been found very profitable to have this service weekly. But it seems to me that it requires very special gifts in the preacher to be able to give weekly such an address with interest to the children.

Once a year this service is on behalf of Christian missions.

At the parochial anniversary of the Church Missionary Society, the deputation takes the sermon. I attribute to this, as one cause, the success of our Juvenile Association—during the last year £44 being collected in our Sunday school on behalf of the Society.

Sunday evenings.—From six to seven we gather together the poorest and lowest of our children, many of whom have not the clothes in which to appear in our ordinary Sunday school. In the winter season the warm fire and comfortable room attracts them, and we have then had frequently not less than three to four hundred, small and great, instructed in Holy Scripture.

Giving a short address, as I usually do, I have felt the importance of this work not second to any in the parish. From thirty to forty teachers are engaged in this self-denying effort. Originally conducted as a service for all the children together, it has now been found advisable to divide them into classes.

Week-days.—A fortnightly Bible class is held in the church on Tuesday afternoons. This reaches children of higher position and young ladies in boarding-schools. At our last gathering upwards of two hundred were present, and I shall ever be thankful for the blessed results in decided conversion to God which in very many cases have resulted from this means of grace.

A meeting is held one evening monthly of our Olive Branch Union—a union of children instituted after our Temperance Crusade, for the promotion of temperance, family happiness, and personal piety. Very happy meetings have been held, about eighty to one hundred children usually being present. An hour and a half is soon gone in singing suitable hymns, recitations, and addresses calculated to promote the objects of the Union.

The circumstances of each parish will determine which of these, or what similar means of grace, would be most useful. For my own part, I should be most thankful, did other engagements permit, to have weekly, on some week-day evening, a short service for the young in our parish.

Were one quarter of the same amount of time given to care for the young which is usually given, and rightly so, to visitation of the sick,

we should probably find the latter far more satisfactory, and many a death-bed would rejoice instead of grieve the pastor's heart.

But how shall the work best be done? What is needful to make such efforts a success?

(1.) You must find the right agents to carry it on. Individual influence, under God, is all-important.

You must find some one, whether in the ministry or not, who can catch the ear and gain the affections of the children. A willingness to stoop to their capacity, a sympathy with their habits of thought, a genial, kindly manner, a readiness to be their friend at all times, an evident reality and earnestness, and a lively way of putting the truth—qualifications like these are almost essential in dealing effectually with the young.

Then as to the subjects most suitable for such services. I would suggest a few: the story of the Creation, the Fall, and the Flood, with various incidents in the lives of the patriarchs—these carefully taught form a good foundation for after-instruction. The sin of Cain, of Adam, of Ahab, of Gehazi, of the children who mocked Elisha, of Ananias and Sapphira—all these are full of profitable lessons.

Then, again, take the lives of those who in their early days have served the Lord—Joseph and Samuel, and Josiah and Abijah, and John the Baptist, and Timothy.

To these may be added short prayers in the Book of Psalms,—as "Keep me as the apple of Thine eye," "Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow," "Create in me a clean heart, O God!"

Selected passages from the Book of Proverbs, especially the "Betters," and those relating to time and the value of true wisdom; also the Book of Jonah, and the story of Daniel and his three companions, may be so treated as to be exceedingly profitable. I would add also such subjects as the prison scenes and death-beds of Scripture, and the incidents in Scripture where the Word itself has been valued or despised—as the finding of the roll by Josiah, the conduct of Jehoiakim in cutting and burning the roll of Jeremiah, Ezra reading the book and expounding it, Christ reading the Scripture at Nazareth, the Ethiopian eunuch searching the Word in his chariot, the Beræans searching the Scriptures after the preaching of Paul,—all these I have found interesting and helpful.

Again, it may be well to take up lessons involving something of a parable or allegory: Noah's dove finding no rest out of the ark, the bird escaping from the snare of the fowler, life a seed-time, a pilgrimage, a race, a battle; or lessons on a particular duty or grace, as truthfulness, kindness, obedience, industry.

But there is no subject more useful for the young than the simple narratives of the Saviour's life. The story of His birth and of His visit to the temple, His works of healing mercy, His parables of divine grace, His baptism, temptation, transfiguration, His cross, resurrection, and ascension; these above all else should be impressed on the hearts of the children.

In the instruction of the young in the great doctrines of the faith, I have found great help in the admirable selection of one hundred texts used in the schools of the Irish Church Missions; whilst to increase their interest in the study of the Word, I have found it useful to take from

time to time subjects from nature, as flowers and fruits, trees and plants, birds, beasts, and fishes, mountains and rivers, lakes and seas. Also I have given them texts to find on parts of the human body. Texts on the eye, the ear, the hand, the foot, the tongue, the lip, will be found fruitful in lessons of wisdom for the daily path.

In fact, I need scarcely remind you that illustrative teaching in every possible form and shape is peculiarly adapted for work amongst children. I know not how it is possible to reach them without it. He who can employ it most skilfully will usually, under God, meet with most success. It awakens attention, it aids the memory, it drives the nail home. When prudently and carefully used, it will leave on the mind an impression which probably will never be effaced.

Would I show the little ones the peril of going astray? I might enforce it by the story of a lamb which had broken through the hedge, and, wandering on the line of rail, in danger every moment of being cut to pieces.

Would I teach them how one sin breaks the law? I might fix it in their minds by picturing a lad throwing a stone at a costly mirror, and breaking it as truly as if fifty had been cast.

Would I teach them the nature of saving faith in a way to reach them? I might point to the gladness of a child in receiving a valuable present, or running to open the door for a beloved parent or friend.

Would I unfold to them the truth that holiness is only to be found by fellowship with Christ? Might I not show it by the Eastern fable? A man takes up in his hand something which smells sweetly. "What are you?" he asks. "I am only a piece of clay, but I have been lying near a sweet rose, and it has given me its own sweet savour."

Would I persuade them to watch against temptation in every form? I might tell them of the powder-mills at Dartford—the trees cut down, the shoes of the visitor taken off; every possible precaution taken lest danger should arise.

But whatever plans we adopt, or methods we employ, we need continually to be reminded that the power and the blessing are from above. We need the dew of divine grace and the breath of the quickening Spirit. We must give ourselves to prayer, or all that we do will be in vain. We must expect great things from God, as well as attempt great things for God. We must rely upon the promise, and be ever looking out for its fulfilment: "I will pour My Spirit on thy seed, and My blessing upon thine offspring."

Nor must we be discouraged by stones of difficulty in the way. We may feel unfitted for the work, or be unable to find the helpers we would desire, but God can supply our need. He can bestow the gift which we lack, or raise up those who can most efficiently help us.

The children we seek to benefit may have sunk very low, and may seem hard to impress. They may be rude and coarse, careless and wilful. They may be slow to learn, and apt to forget. They may be proud and perverse, and repay your toil by apparent ingratitude. Yet bear with them tenderly, patiently, for Christ's sake. The evil may be on the surface, whilst something of good may be working within; and the fruit will yet be seen. The good Spirit shall make the seed to grow, and the desert shall yet bloom and blossom as the rose. Remember, above all

things, they are the lambs for whom Christ died, and which He hath purchased with His own blood. And to none more than to such as care for the young does the great promise belong: "They that be wise (or teachers) shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

ADDRESS.

The Venerable Archdeacon Emery.

It was only at the especial request of the committee that I undertook to say a few words on this subject, and when I see so many friends on the platform better able to deal with this matter, I am quite ashamed to stand here. It seems to me that the large attendance to-night shows the use of sections, and the interest taken in the manifold works and developments of the Church's labours and desires. I am surprised and gratified to see it is so well attended, for I scarcely expected it to be so. Yet why not? remembering our Lord's words, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones;" why, when we remember how it is said, our Lord took the children up in His arms and blessed them? I have liked much in the papers just read, but I differ as to the mode of teaching children suggested by the last reader. I confess I would approach children in teaching them in a different spirit. I would rather approach them as children of God, members of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. The preaching of conversion seems rather to be suited for adults, after the sad experience of the power of sin and temptation, than for children; and it seems far more agreeable to the Word of God, and the teaching of the Church, to approach them as I have suggested, than to speak of conversion; for we must remember that Christ has said, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Until within comparatively recent times, we knew and thought very little of children, and children's services. Our habit was to put them away in the dark galleries and corners, though we expected from them the principal part of the clerking. It was the custom, in my boyhood, to catechise unfortunate children from the Parochial School, in Lent, after the second lesson: for the benefit, I suppose, of other folk. I sat in a pew and listened to this formal catechising. I don't think that method has answered; and it is a matter for grief, that although we have the religious education of the people in our hands—we have the children in our National and other schools from infancy to twelve years—yet these children do not often appear in the Church afterwards. There are many reasons for this lamentable state of things, and one is the want of freedom in our parish churches; it is due also, in a great measure, to our not having paid special attention to children, and provided suitable services for them. When I went to Geneva, some years ago, I was very pleased to find a service for young children held regularly each Sunday morning at eight o'clock. There was a simple sermon, a few prayers of a suitable character, and one or two appropriate hymns. Now, why should there not be a special children's service in every parish? I am glad to know that children's services are held frequently in many places. Some schools go into church once a month in the afternoon, and have a service; in other churches there is a children's service every Sunday. The manner of conducting them is different. One of these services in which I took part in the

South of England was in a church crowded with children and parents, and I remember after preaching the children's sermon, I saw an old woman, and said to her, "I am afraid the preaching was too simple for you." "No, sir," she replied, "we want simple preaching; why, we want children's sermons." These services may often meet the wants of other portions of the people, who sincerely desire the milk of the Word. We had a children's service in Ely Cathedral, on the Day of Intercession—no one objected. We had banners, and a procession, with good hymns. A few collects, two or three hymns, and an address on missions formed the service. Those who address children need not be merely doctrinal, but illustrate with tales and fables, and other matter likely to guide and form life and character, as well as rivet attention. In these children's services we should not interfere with the school work, and yet I think the children may from time to time be taken to church, and we might use in that way the half-hour we are allowed by the Education Code for religious instruction. We might use Saints' Day thus, and days set apart for missions. Then there are other services which interest children. A friend of mine, when he takes his school children for their annual treat, borrows the use of the church of the place visited, and has a short service; and the children enjoy it as much as the buns and tea. A lady once remarked she was afraid of children's services, because she thought children were getting too independent and puffed up with feelings of their great importance. Though we may not agree with this, we may be warned by it to be very careful to make the service and teaching fit for the children. But if we are to have these services, and to do what we ought to meet the wants of Christ's flock, we must not leave it all to the pastor. It is impossible that the pastor can do it all, and, indeed, he may not be the most fitted to conduct children's service. Many clergymen, who are good pastors, have not the special gifts required to teach children. The clergy then must be willing to have the services, and recognise the help of laymen, properly sanctioned and duly authorised, who have special gifts for the work. This meeting shows that the Church of England is full of life and energy, and determination to meet the spiritual wants and requirements of the people, young and old, as far as it is possible for her to do so.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. E. A. Hillyard, M.A.

I will devote the brief time at my disposal to two practical suggestions. The first is very simple, namely, that if you wish to hold children's attention to a tale, it must not be read from a book, but a tale told in the narrator's words. This secured the omission of the writer's "padding" and fine writing, and the use of incident and Saxon English. The second suggestion is to utilise the time allowed by school-time tables for religious instruction, by giving the children the lesson conveyed through the eye and ear in a children's Eucharist. At St Laurence's, Norwich, the choir chairs are cleared from before the altar, and the whole space filled, at times, with children, who took an attentive and intelligent share in a choral Communion before an altar bright with cross, candles, and flowers. Throughout the service the children sang hymns appropriate to the Divine action as it proceeded. For my own part I can never forget a children's Eucharist witnessed at a Children's Home, conducted by Miss Cotton, at Leytonstone. The service was similar to the one I have described, but the congregation were children

drawn from an inconceivably degraded class, and yet their attention was secured and their behaviour most exemplary, for they had been thoroughly taught the meaning of all that they saw and heard, proving that the service of Holy Communion could be adapted even to their needs.

The Rev. J. F. Kitto, M.A.

I PRESUME to speak on this subject, because I have for the last fifteen years never failed to avail myself of any opportunity of conducting children's services, and I want to bear testimony to the success of the movement. I must, however, first protest against the service described by the last speaker being regarded as a children's service at all. It is one of a very peculiar character, for which the Prayer Book gives no kind of authority whatever, and which is altogether out of harmony with the teaching of our Church. Special services for children may be held either in the church, at a different time from the ordinary service, or at any time in a school or mission room. Of course the services held in the church, with abbreviated forms of prayer, are those which we most value; but the difficulty is that they must always be conducted by a clergyman; and I will venture to say it is not every clergyman who can address children. We are therefore compelled to hold these services in the school, and conducted by earnest and fervent laymen, who have been interested and trained in this work. I have had ten laymen in my parish who could conduct such services, and I have five children's services every Sunday. But all such services should lead up to the special service in church, and should prepare the children to take part in and enjoy the church services. In this way children may be taught to look on, being allowed to attend a church service as a privilege and a favour. But it should be remembered that it is worth while to bestow care and pains upon the preparation of the special services in church. I have been called upon to conduct a service myself in a strange parish, and have found that everything was left to me, even the selection of the hymns and prayers; there was no attempt to infuse any spirit into the service. At these services the choir should be in their places, and if that cannot be done you must make some other provision to enable the children to join heartily in the singing of well-known hymns and tunes. A plan which has been tried with much success is to have four hymns printed, and circulated throughout the parish to the children and their parents one month before the special service is held. This enables the children and their friends to learn these hymns in their families and practise them, so that when they come to church everybody is prepared to sing those hymns, and to sing them with fervour and spirit. That plan alone is sufficient to throw spirit and life into our children's services.

The Rev. Evan Daniel, M.A., Principal of the Battersea Training College.

I HAVE not had much experience in conducting children's services, but I have had some experience in teaching, and I will therefore offer a few practical remarks on that branch of the subject. I have often been struck with the singular incapacity of the clergy for teaching children, and this I take it is because they are not trained to teach children. I think one of the greatest boons we could have would be the establishment of a chair for teaching the principles of the science of teaching at the universities; so that young men proposing to take holy orders might have proper instruction in this most important

part of their work. I have seen clergymen attempting to catechise children while walking up and down the aisle of the church. The children behind him could, of course, not hear him, and only those in front could see his face. No professional teacher would approve of such a practice as this. And this leads me to remark that clergymen might learn many a useful lesson from the national school teacher in the science and art of teaching. Any one who addresses children should take up some place from which he can command the whole of the children at a single glance; if not, half his instruction will be lost. It is a simple matter to mention, but clergymen will do well to remember the fact, that you cannot well see anything outside an angle of sixty degrees. The first aim in teaching should be to gain the attention of the children; the next, to maintain it. Children will always pay attention if you interest them. Dry statements of doctrine will neither draw nor keep their attention. Experience is in favour of teaching children through concrete truth rather than abstract truth. There is scarcely an important doctrinal truth which cannot be taught through some apposite story. Mr Maclagan, the new vicar of Kensington, gave last year a series of lessons from "The Pilgrim's Progress," which were most successful. To maintain attention you must have variety. You must have variety in the subjects taught, in the mode of treatment, in the posture of the children, and in other ways. When children are tired of sitting let them stand; when they are tired of standing let them sit; when they are tired of listening let them sing; when they are tired of plain prose give them poetry. They soon weary, and change will be found to be rest.

The Rev. R. W. Randall, M.A.

At the risk of throwing away one minute of my time, I am going to enforce a warning which fell from the preacher at our opening service, that we are not to plume ourselves on the successful doings of the Congress. Archdeacon Emery has just congratulated us on the interest shown in our subject by the large attendance at its discussion. But I must remind him that at the Bath Congress this subject was discussed, not, as on this evening, in a sectional meeting, but in the great Congress Hall, and that the Hall was full. There is a special reason for my wishing to join in the discussion. I live in a very strange parish, for in my parish there is not a single poor man to be found, and my experience is therefore among the educated classes. I have learnt one thing, that the educated classes, as they are called, because they are well educated in other matters, need a very careful education in the doctrines of the Church. I have been in the habit of holding children's services, and I have seen the church well filled with the elder members of the congregation, who learn much through their presence at such services. The simple course which I adopt is this: We use some metrical Litany, such as one of those that have been prepared by one whom I am glad to see amongst us, and to whom we owe so many sound books of devotion for the loyal members of the Church, Mr Hoskins. Before this Litany the Litany of the Church is sung, and this is followed by catechising. The subject of the catechising is for the most part some point of doctrine. This is illustrated freely from stories gathered from the lives of servants of God in our own day, and from that storehouse of example and encouragement, the lives of the servants and saints of God in days gone by. Depend on it, that if such a practice of catechising is well carried out, the higher classes will be thankful for the instruction which they will receive in the simple truths and duties of religion, which many never knew, just because it is taken for granted that they knew them. They will learn many a lesson which will be of use to them in the difficulties of life, and which will be a support and strength to them in the last trials which beset the soul before it is called from the body to give in its account to the Judge.

THE RECOGNITION AND EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL PREACHERS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. Canon Titcomb.

How shall we devise means for achieving the greatest good with the resources which are most available?

So speaks the philosophy of this world. Much more should it be the philosophy of the Church, since, under the constraining influences of Redemption, we are called to consecrate all our time, strength, and talent to the divine glory! Viewed, indeed, in that light, any work left undone, or done in a slovenly, half-finished manner, remains a debt of obligation undischarged, which needs the profoundest humiliation and repentance.

It appears to me that it is somewhat in this lowly spirit we should address ourselves to the question now before us. Year after year since the nineteenth century opened, we have had ringing in our ears one long desponding cry, How shall we overtake the spiritual necessities of our ever-growing population? To this end we have built churches, subdivided parishes, increased clergy, and employed lay-helpers. We have worked the press, multiplied schools, used the platform, and laboured in mission-rooms. If I may be allowed to speak of my own experience, let me say that twenty-five years ago I endeavoured myself to commence the work of an evangelist under an organised system of open-air preaching. This was sanctioned by the rural dean, and was carried forward as a distinctive part of our regular parochial machinery. It was a novel effort in the Church of England at that time, and subjected me in certain quarters to the suspicion of being a very loose kind of Churchman. But the character of my parish—it was the well-known parish of Barnwell, in Cambridge—appeared to me to justify the experiment, and the results were most satisfactory. Shortly after this, Canon Miller commenced another system of evangelistic mission-work, viz., special church services, continued night after night, by select preachers among the working men of Birmingham. I call attention to the fact that these commencements in the direction of special mission-preaching preceded by twenty years those more recent efforts which have been made in our ten days' mission-services throughout the country—a fact which ought surely to be recognised by every candid mind in regard to the active Church work of the older evangelical clergy, inasmuch as attempts are not altogether wanting which represent the modern revival movements of our Church as entirely due to the prolific energy of our High Church brethren.

The solemn question, however, still remains, How far have we overtaken the work which is to be done? Does it not still move on before us, like an *ignis fatuus* in the swamp, continually eluding our grasp? Who can say the work has been achieved? On the contrary, must we

not confess that there are fields in the visible Church of this country where, instead of driving in the gospel plough, and sowing the good seed of the kingdom, we are but scratching up here and there a clod upon the surface, and gathering no harvest but weeds?

What, then, is wanted?

Far be it from me to speak dogmatically, but feeling strongly on the subject, I must speak boldly, and without either circumlocution or apology. Let me say then at once, that, in my judgment, we no longer need a set of voluntary mission-preachers taken from the ranks of the parish clergy, whose manifold engagements will only allow them to do the work under strong pressure and by spasmodic exertions, and very often to the injury of their own parishes, but a distinct and settled class of evangelists. I dare not call them an order, as some do; for the Church of England knows only of three orders in the ministry. I mean, however, men set apart in every diocese under duly constituted authority, and, let me add, laymen as well as clergymen; for though I have not time to argue the matter, I believe that every faithful layman, being a "priest unto God," has a perfect right to preach Christ to his brethren, providing he does not interfere with Church order. Such men, then, having been properly tested, and found gifted for the work, I would have them go from place to place, without any parochial ties or ordinary liturgical restraints, to do the mission-work of the Church under a recognised and properly-organised system.

Why not? Would it not be scriptural? Is it not written, "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors, and teachers"? (Eph. iv. 11.) Why not? Has not even the Church of Rome her preaching friars and mission-fathers distinct from her parish priests? Why not? Think of the souls that are perishing, like ships upon the rocks, within sight of shore. Who can say, We have done our best to save them; we have exhausted all our efforts? No doubt every one of our former efforts has been useful. But is there not more remaining to be done? I put it, therefore, to the Church of England whether the time has not now arrived when it would be well to institute some definite organisation of evangelistic preachers distinct from the parochial clergy, through whom she may not only gain fresh converts to the service of the Lord, but become reinforced by a new generation of faithful and devoted children.

I admit there are difficulties. Some will say, Where are the men to be found? and if found, how are they to be secured and sustained? I reply, that if the Church be only in earnest—if she only awake to her work with holy faith and prayer, there can be no doubt that the Lord will soon raise up qualified labourers, and that the laity will support them. *Others* may object, How are we to avoid the jealousy with which some of our brethren might resent the intrusion of these preachers on their parochial rights and liberties? My reply is, We need not intrude upon those rights and liberties. For—blessed be God—the life and zeal of the Church is now amply sufficient to allow scope for the employment of such preachers in every diocese, without the slightest probability of their ever being obliged to encroach upon places where they would not be welcomed. The fields are white unto the harvest. *Others* may exclaim, How are the difficulties to be surmounted which arise from our differences of theological opinion? The proper answer to this question

is, that in the case of every true evangelist there must ever be a spirituality of mind and tone of thought which will lift him up high above the atmosphere of religious controversy, taking from him all narrowness and bitterness, and filling him with nothing but that holy fire of love which seeks to win souls to Christ. The truth is (and it may be hailed as a glorious witness to the fact of our spiritual unity) that no quarrels in the Church ever take place when hearts feel burdened with sin, and are fleeing for refuge to the same Cross as their only and abiding refuge. For the most part, I believe that our differences only *begin* where the real work of evangelisation *ends;* that work is simply to preach Christ, and His righteousness and atonement, together with conversion of heart by the Holy Ghost, and the need of self-consecration to God, topics upon which, thank Heaven, we are all practically agreed. As for the degree to which our various forms of Church teaching may afterwards come in to separate many of us, I believe it has little or nothing to do with this preliminary work of awaking dead souls to the faith and love of the Lord Jesus. And what is more (I speak freely, my lord, for in Church Congresses this is our wont), any evangelist who would attempt to confuse these two branches of teaching would be utterly unworthy of his office.

Assuming, then, that these difficulties can be surmounted, what is the course to be pursued?

I venture to submit that, the men being found, and duly authorised by the Bishop of the diocese, they should go forth prepared to utilise any place of meeting best calculated in the locality to suit the necessities of the case, the question of after-meetings for anxious inquirers being left with the parochial clergy, by whose invitation the preachers were working.

I would further suggest that, taking a lesson from our late American visitors, hymn-singing should be made a large element in this work. If each clerical evangelist could have one lay evangelist as a yoke-fellow, capable not only of speaking to the people, but of conducting a choir, and even occasionally singing a solo hymn, all the better. Nothing tended more powerfully to excite an interest, and draw crowds to the meetings of those American visitors, than this practice. Why should it be objected to? There are good church hymns in use among us which might be made quite as popular as any of theirs, hymns which as clearly set forth the way of salvation, and appeal fully as much to the heart and conscience. Let me note, *e.g.*, such as the following:—

"O Jesus, Thou art standing
Outside the fast-closed door," &c.

"I was a wandering sheep,
I did not love the fold," &c.

"Take up thy cross, the Saviour said,
If thou wouldst My disciple be," &c.

"Weary of earth, and laden with my sin,
I look at heaven, and long to enter in," &c.

Why should the singing of such hymns, even in *solo*, be objected to? Have we not solos sung in our anthems at cathedrals, and in choral services everywhere? Would the variation, therefore, be one of principle? If not, why, upon its being found attractive, should we resist it? Is it not time to get out of our old ruts, and, without abandoning Church principles, to

go forward on the wheels of modern progress? These are not days in which we should be afraid either of novelty or of worldly criticisms. But they *are* days when we may justly be afraid of resting too much upon our dignity, and of allowing others to pass us by in the race, just because we think ourselves too respectable to be stripped of some of our accustomed clothing. The times in which we live speak trumpet-tongued to our Church. Is she not surrounded by bitter foes, who would, if they could, cast her crown to the earth, and shake her battlements into the dust? What better defence, then, could she make than to exhibit her spiritual strength in the way now indicated—sending out on all sides loving and large-hearted clergy, who, without the fear of man or the shame of the cross, would shed forth everywhere the life and power of God's Spirit, and so prove the mission of the Church too sacred to be destroyed.

May not this work, then, be attempted? Would that the present Congress might prove the anvil upon which our thoughts upon this subject could be hammered out while we are now warm with zeal for God and with love for immortal souls. If it require further discussion, let it be brought before our ruri-decanal chapters, and our diocesan conferences and synods. Let me appeal with all due respect to our bishops; for it is to them we must look to put the finishing stroke to this great business. The Church is waiting for it. The resources for its execution are available. During the last few years we have had men educating for this mission-work who are now ready for employment. Is it not a responsibility—a trust—a talent? God forbid that when the Master comes to His last great act of reckoning with us we may ever have to say with the man in the parable, "I was afraid, and I hid Thy talent in the earth" (Matt. xxv. 25).

The Rev. W. H. Hutchings, M.A., Sub-Warden of Clewer.

As an apology for any crudeness of thought or poverty of expression in the following paper, I should wish to state in commencing that it has been drawn up at a very short notice, as my friend the Rev. Rowland Corbet, who was first appointed to address you on the subject of "The Recognition and Employment of Special Preachers," has through illness been prevented from carrying out his purpose; and this is the more to be deplored as the subject was one to which he had given much attention, and upon which he could, as a mission-preacher, have addressed you by drawing upon the treasure of his personal experience, whilst my remarks will labour more or less under the disadvantage of being theoretical.

The term "special preachers," I imagine, is designedly large enough to shelter under it both a clerical and a lay agent. I will first confine what I have to say to preachers who are in holy orders, and if the inexorable bell does not ring, will go on to the consideration of lay-preachers.

I. The first branch of our subject admits of being viewed in several lights. First, I would consider it in relation to the "special preachers" themselves; secondly, in reference to the parochial clergy; and thirdly, on the side of the congregations.

1. With regard *to the preachers themselves*, they are styled in the title

of our subject "special." I take it that that word describes not merely the nature of the occasion for which they are to be employed, but also attributes to them some excellence which distinguishes them from the ordinary run of preachers.

The power to preach effectively is not given to all men, nor upon all who are ordained, however valuable their services may be in other directions, does the mantle of the prophet descend. None save a few enthusiasts would now say that all that was required for making a preacher was the courage and faith to commit himself without preparation to the action of a divine afflatus, which is to fall upon him at the time of delivery, and provide him with the thoughts he needs and the power to give utterance to them. The advice to "take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak" (Mark xiii. 11)—besides the fact that it referred to appearing before hostile tribunals, and the self-defence on such occasions needed—was given to those who were to be the subjects of such an effusion of the Spirit as carried with it preternatural gifts, and therefore cannot without presumption be acted on in the present day. Preaching depends partly on natural qualifications, partly on training, partly on the spiritual life.

(*a.*) There are some who have a rich measure of natural qualifications, such as strength of mind, power of voice, grace of manner, width of sympathy; yet how many who are holy and learned men fail in preaching, simply from the lack of the power to give utterance to their thoughts? But few, when compared with the mass of mankind, are born with the tongue of the orator and the gift of persuasiveness. The question then is, if all have not the capacity for speaking and moving others, how are those who do possess it to be utilised? I answer—By bringing their power and influence to bear on as wide an area of human life as possible; and this is to be accomplished, not by confining them to one parish, and that sometimes a thinly-populated one, but by keeping them free from parochial obligations, so that they may travel from one place to another, for the purpose of giving missions, or preaching courses of sermons. I will go further, and say that I believe great vehemence in preaching, and forcible appeals to the emotions, and harrowing descriptions of the final results of sin, though valuable as restoratives, become positively hurtful when they are the normal food of the same congregation. Such preaching is profitable rather for its medicinal than for its nutritive qualities. I remember some one saying, who had just been kindled by the lava of burning utterances which a certain preacher had poured forth, "I feel that to hear him rarely may be highly beneficial, but not as a regular thing." To employ, then, these men who are special preachers, in giving missions, rather than to fix them down in one place, seems to me not only the best way of turning them to account, but also of hindering these powers from producing an unhealthy effect.

(*b.*) But natural powers need training; whether those powers are great or small, they must be educated and informed. Therefore I would suggest that there should be in every diocese, under episcopal inspection, a house set apart for the use of "an order of preachers," where every opportunity should be afforded, by means of a good library, the assistance of a learned clergyman, practice in preaching, and mutual conference, for the development of the natural gift. The parish clergyman has every-

thing to do, and from the very universality of his occupations, his sermons must suffer. He has to attend to schools and clubs, to visit sick and poor, to govern societies and guilds, to undertake services and occasional duty, to keep accounts, and attend to social calls. The story of the ecclesiastical professor who asked the young clergyman who had been sent forth into a populous parish, how he was getting on with the Fathers, and received the reply, "Not at all well, I never find them at home," is hardly perhaps an exaggerated illustration of the distance the very idea of study is often pressed away from the mind by the urgent and manifold calls of parish work. Now the "special preacher" is exempted from this distracting diversity of employment. He has but one work, and the duties which may arise around it. He will not be lacking in experience. It may be said, 'What better preparation for preaching than parochial experience?' Quite so; our mission-preacher will have, from the continual exercise of his office, parochial experience as far as that experience is exclusively spiritual, and it is only in so far as it is spiritual that it can be an advantage in the work of converting souls. The mission-preacher will have to guide for the time those who are awakened by his appeals, and thence will he glean quite a large spiritual experience. Concentration is a secret of strength in this as in other departments of human life and labour; and thus, I contend, a great advantage must arise, if to our over-worked parish clergy, from time to time, one should come who is trained in exegetical, moral, and dogmatic theology, and who thus, from the stores which by unity of aim and occupation he has been enabled to amass, may give forth to the necessities of others who are more actively engaged.

(*c.*) But I pass to a higher region of life still. The men who give themselves to this work must be in an especial sense spiritual men. It is not so much the power of eloquence and of knowledge, as the power of holiness, which makes itself felt, and gives a ring of sincerity to the utterances of the preacher. I would venture, then, to suggest that those who are drawn to give themselves to this work should be formed into a Community, and have some rule of life which would help them, by the appointment of times of prayer, meditation, and self-examination, towards the attainment of holiness, and that one of their number be chosen to be the head of the household, who should have the power of directing his forces, and be communicated with by those who seek the assistance of the order. I know of two attempts to supply special preachers, one in this diocese, and the other in that of Oxford. I refer to the Cowley fathers, and to those at Stoke-upon-Terne. I believe in Cowley "the Society of St John Evangelist" numbers about twenty devoted men, whose work is known throughout the length and breadth of the land, and who have the honour of being the first promoters of the London Mission, 1869. At Stoke there are eight clerical members of that Society of preachers, and their head, but for illness, would have been now addressing you; these act under the sanction of the President of this Congress, the Bishop of Lichfield, and go into different parishes for the purpose of conducting missions, retreats, and for preaching courses of sermons.

It may be said that these two societies are distinctively High Church, and therefore may adopt a line of action in missions with which some do not sympathise; but my reason for referring to them is not one of choice but

of necessity, for I am not aware of any society with the same object which has been set on foot by our brethren of the Evangelical school, though it is the school through whose instrumentality, be it said to their honour, the dry, lifeless essay, which used to be the weekly production of the pulpit, has been exchanged for the vigorous appeal to the heart and conscience, and the endeavour to bring home to the soul the work of Christ. But whatever our opinions may be, this fact remains untouched, that those who have given themselves to the work of special preaching have found themselves utterly unable to cope with the number of applications for help which have come to them; and this is enough to show that the parochial system itself is insufficient to meet the needs of the present age—from no fault of the system itself, but from increase of life and population.

2. Now the employment of "special preachers" must be regarded from our second point of view, *in reference to the parochial clergy.*

(*a.*) I would lay down as a rule that no special preacher be allowed to officiate in a parish unless he has the consent of the incumbent; and perhaps I may add, a consent given after the incumbent has held some consultation with the regular communicants, if the invitation of the special preacher is for the conduct of a mission. This would prevent (if in times so changed there could be such a possibility) the recurrence of any of those feuds which resulted from a collision between the secular and regular clergy in the thirteenth century, when the "religious preachers" were by a bull of Alexander IV. exempted from the jurisdiction both of bishops and parish priests. In a national church there is no external ecclesiastical power which can interfere with the mutual relations of the clergy, and the fact that the special preacher must be invited by the incumbent to minister in his parish, places the special preacher at the mercy of incumbents, without whose consent no opportunity for the exercise of his function could be afforded.

(*b.*) The advantage to the incumbent from the employment of special preachers may be great in this respect; they may be able to help him by using a plainness of speech which the regular minister could not, or would find it most difficult to employ. Even supposing the incumbent to be a man of considerable preaching power, yet from the delicacy of his position, from constant association with the people, from the knowledge he possesses of them, his utterance may be sometimes fettered by the fear lest his admonition should become too personal, or be deemed a breach of confidence by his parishioners; whereas the stranger who arrives, disentangled with the web of parish strife or parish tattle, can say without offence, or the danger of making matters worse, what the parish priest could not venture to say. But suppose the parish priest to be no preacher (it is a modern idea that every "parochus" must be also a preacher, he might be a first-rate parish priest in all other respects; and on the contrary he may have preaching powers, and yet not be the right man to be in charge of a parish), what an advantage in this case to the incumbent is the aid of the mission-preacher. It would be like that which Moses craved, because he was "slow of speech, and of a slow tongue," and gained from Aaron his brother, who could "speak well." The new mode of address, directness of appeal, aptness of illustration, interest of anecdote, dramatic power, would have an awakening effect, and give a new impulse to the parochial machine, which the incumbent, when it was once given, could direct. It

has been said that such a gift is liable to excite jealousy in the one who does not possess it; but such an idea only suggests that there are cases where the parochus himself may profit by the elevating power of a mission. If nothing but the benefit of the souls of the people is sought, then parochial clergyman and missioner have the same end in view, and work, though with different gifts, as the instruments of the same Spirit, and therefore should mutually rejoice; though one may plant and the other water, or one sow and the other reap, they both would rejoice together. To such a thought—I had almost said accusation—every true-hearted parish priest will reply, "Enviest thou for my sake? Would God all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" (Numb. xi. 29).

(*c.*) There are *two* other benefits which may accrue to the parish priest from the establishment of "an order of preachers."

(1.) It is often found, in the country especially, difficult in cases of illness, or "breakdown" from over-work, to obtain a clergyman to do the duty, and sometimes there is anxiety when he is obtained as to his antecedants. An order of recognised preachers would supply this need, and relieve the sick and weary from the anxiety and toil now inevitable in finding a substitute.

(2.) But further than this, it might be possible, perhaps, and an advantage for the parish priest himself, to find the rest he needs in the house which has been set apart as the home of the order of preachers. He may then for a little while be away from the cares of his parish, and recruit his bodily, and it may be also his intellectual and spiritual, health, and the library, regular offices of prayer, mutual intercourse with the clergy, may be all of benefit. He may stay for a while in the house of the order of preachers, whilst one of the special preachers might reside in the rectory or parsonage. I have rather assumed that these special preachers would be single men, as it would be impossible for married clergymen to lead this wandering life, or to live in community. This interchange of residence would also have the benefit of preventing the members of the order from the danger of narrowness of sympathy, and the liability of forming too distinct a caste; whilst the advantage to the parochial clergy would be considerable, both in finding a ready and reliable substitute, and a quiet spot where they may give themselves to study and prayer. This time of retirement would not be lost to the parishioners, who would afterwards enjoy the fruits of it, in the higher spirituality, the greater knowledge, and it may be more vigorous health, of their pastor on his return to them. This last would be the more ensured if the site of the house for preachers were chosen with a view to its salubrity. Perhaps I may be permitted to mention that the "Clergy House of Rest" at Malvern is one step in this last-named direction: though it does not send out preachers, it affords rest to those who seek it within its walls, and times of Retreat.

(*d.*) Again, the parish priest has the most important part to take with regard to a mission. It must not be imagined that the special preacher will do all; the ultimate success of a mission really lies with the parochial clergy. They have to prepare the soil to receive the seed; secondly, they have to tend, to nurture and preserve the tender shoot. A mission with the best preachers may fail for lack of receptivity amongst the people, who without preparation may flock together, rather with the interest of

curiosity or intellectual excitement, than with a deep sense of the responsibility which such an opportunity involves. To preserve those who are touched by God's grace from returning to evil ways, to sustain the impression made, is the anxious and delicate work of the pastor when the special preachers have withdrawn themselves. The special preachers are not to supersede, but to supplement, the ordinary parochial machinery.

3. And now to view their employment in more direct *reference to the people.*

(*a.*) Some object to missions on the ground that they are of too emotional a character, and here it will be necessary to separate use from abuse. Souls are reached in different ways—some through an emotional, others through an intellectual, entrance. The feelings are a great aid in the beginnings of repentance. "Not as if," says one, "this excitement of mind were to last, but it will do its office *in setting us off.*" The emotions may be stirred, it is true, and the higher powers of mind and will remain untouched; the sweetness of music, the beauty of ritual, the charm of eloquence, may produce a passing sensation which is only a species of religious luxury, and this is valueless if it stands alone. But when that emotion is not the solitary effect which is produced on our complex being, but either introductory to, or collateral with, or resulting from, the action of the higher powers—the will, the mind, the conscience—then emotion is a great help towards repentance; and it is emotion, standing in one of these three relations to the higher powers, which the mission-preacher strives to call forth.

(*b.*) It has been said, again, with regard to the effect upon the people, that the reaction is a greater evil than the passing energy of life is a good, and that things in the parish become as bad, or worse, than they were before. Now, is there not here a danger of exaggerating the law of reaction? Is it not to view the mission in too human a light, and to disparage the vitality of the effects of grace; and moreover, may we not be precipitating a reaction in our judgment, which, in fact, does not set in with such rapidity as we imagine? Those who know most on this subject say that the lively remembrance of a good mission will last two or three years. "But what, then, is to be done," said an objector, "when the impression has died out, and the three years are past?" and the ready, short, and practical reply of the divine was, "Have another." And if the "order of preachers" throve in each diocese, there would be no reason why in large parishes the effort might not be repeated after an interval of a few years. But if the effect, viewed generally, must of course in some measure gradually subside, yet in individuals that effect is lasting. The emotional features soon pass away, it is true; but after they have "set us off," "taking from the beginnings of obedience its grievousness," they may lead to a deeper inner life, in which mind and will, sustained by grace, can do their work, less aided by feelings. To the fact that missions do produce lasting results (as far as man can judge), I have no doubt all who have had any experience in them will join me in testifying. There have been many instances where not only conversion, but a life of entire self-dedication, has been dated from attendance at some mission.

(*c.*) But the mission is needed for the people, not only for those who are living in open sin, but also for the lukewarm and indifferent; it will fan the smouldering spark into life. As we have dormant powers which

need some stirring cause to evoke them in the natural life, so is it in the spiritual life. Grace is not only an abiding possession, but a moving force; and theologians tell us that the possession of indwelling grace is not sufficient for deliverance from falling and for growth in virtues; unless it be aided by grace from without also, which passes through the soul, and stirs into action the inward power. Now the mission and the special preacher come across the parish like the ray or inspiration of actual grace, kindling the latent energy of life within it. The mission comes, like the angel, to stir the pool, whose waters, unless they are set in motion, have no healing effect upon the enfeebled frame. Thus, whether to awake the sinner or to arouse the careless, I believe missions are an inestimable advantage to the parishes where they are held; and to have these missions as a part of acknowledged and regular weapons of spiritual warfare, we must have soldiers trained and at hand, who may be called out to use them, and therefore I espouse most warmly the establishment of an order of recognised and special preachers.

II. We have hitherto spoken only of the special preacher who is in holy orders. Now let us look briefly at the subject on the lay side. I said the expression "special preacher" was large enough to contain both aspects.

1. No doubt there will be a diversity of opinion upon this point; therefore, perhaps, I had better first mention the reasons which would justify permission being given to some laymen to preach. They are chiefly four—(*a.*) The fewness of ordained ministers, in comparison with the increasing masses of the people, render it impossible for the clergyman to do all the work which has to be done; (*b.*) I believe there are men who have no call to the ministry, who yet have certain capacities for addressing their fellow-men, which may be utilised in the work of the Church; (*c.*) Their employment will hinder those who possess these gifts, and feel that they have no outlet for them in the Church, from going elsewhere, where they can make use of them, and find that office and distinction for which they crave; (*d.*) If some of these persons are drawn more from the ranks of the people than the clergy at present are, they will be able to preach and think in a way which the people can understand; whereas a clergyman who has a classical education finds too often a foreign equivalent rise to his lips in place of the common Saxon word, so that while the Liturgy is in the vernacular, the sermon is partly "in an unknown tongue." We have heard of the French writer who, before he went to press, read over to his housekeeper his compositions, to discover from her whether his thoughts and diction were above those for whom he wrote. Our lay-preacher would not need this process, if selected from those who are mentally on the same level as himself. But if, on the other hand, he were a man of high education, he would have the power of viewing questions from the layman's side, and of mixing with the world more than the parochial clergyman could consistently do.

2. And now to glance at this question in reference to ecclesiastical history.

(*a.*) It seems at first that bishops only undertook the office of preaching; we find, however, that Origen went from Alexandria into Palestine to preach there (though a layman) by invitation of the bishop of that country. And when Demetrius was offended by this, Alexander defended his act by quoting some precedents for lay-preaching. Perhaps, however, the

point in dispute was whether Origen ought to preach *in the presence of a bishop.* The 98th Canon of the 4th Council of Carthage, A.D. 398, lays down that the layman shall not teach in presence of clerics, unless bidden by them to do so; and the 99th, that women, however holy and learned, may not presume to teach even in the assembly. These two Canons seem to indirectly sanction lay-preaching *when clerics are absent.* Whatever might have been the practice in the early Church, when we come to the Middle Ages, we find preaching orders of laymen sanctioned throughout Western Christendom.

(*b.*) In the Old Testament the prophetical office did not presuppose the sacerdotal. The Jewish layman was allowed to speak and read publicly in the synagogue, a liberty of which we find our Lord availing Himself in the synagogue of Nazareth. And although our blessed Lord knit together into one in His own Person the offices of prophet, priest, and king, yet as before in the Jewish Church, so afterwards in the Christian Church, they are capable of being separately exercised. It appears, then, that to permit laymen sometimes to preach is not repugnant to any fundamental Church principle. It is only liable to create a confusion between the clerical and lay office, when the clergy, by their teaching or practice, do not sufficiently make clear what are their exclusively sacerdotal functions, or where the layman has permission to preach without proper restrictions.

3. The restrictions which I would venture to suggest are four, and are contained under the heads—*Matter, Place, Sanction, Qualifications.* (*a.*) Their preaching should be of an elementary and awakening character; laymen should not be suffered to preach upon sacramental mysteries, or to enter upon deep questions of doctrine, which should be reserved for the parish priest. (*b.*) As to the *place* of preaching. They should not be allowed to preach in churches, or consecrated places of any kind, as that would be a direct contravention of the 23d Article of our religion. John Wesley warned his disciples that because they were made preachers, they must be careful not to act as priests. (*c.*) As to *sanction.* No layman should officiate in any parish without the sanction of the bishop of the diocese, and that of the incumbent of the parish. (*d.*) The layman, before his name is placed on the list of lay-preachers, should pass an examination as to his knowledge of the Scriptures, and shall be required to produce testimonials as to conduct. If he is found of sufficient knowledge and character, he shall receive a certificate or "testamur," which shall be recalled upon any great failure in doctrine or life. I think if the employment of laymen as preachers is hedged about with these restrictions, they may form a valuable aid as subalterns to the clerical special preachers in the conduct of missions, and to the clergy whose work lies in the great centres of manufacture and commerce.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. D. R. Norman, Rector of Stafford.

In speaking on this subject of Special Preachers, I want to allude to a word or two in Canon Titcomb's paper. I believe he would like an order of preachers rather than that special preachers should be drawn from the parochial clergy, and the later paper seemed to lead to the same conclusion. There are two orders of such men in existence —one at Stoke-on-Terne, and the other at Cowley. Well, it is true that those men are specially trained, but still there are parishes where, if a man came from either of those two institutions, there would be quite a little stir. I think it should be in the power of the bishops to draw from the ranks of the clergymen those who are apt and fit for this work. There is abundance of room in the Church for every man who has such special gift as mission-preaching. I was led into this kind of work myself by a letter of the Rev. George Venables. I had then a little parish, and I thought it would be doing some service to go to a large parish in Leicester to help the vicar, and there learn the needs of the people. From time to time I have done this during the last four or five years, and I recommend country clergy to spend part of their vacation in some large town. Many vicars would be glad to have their help for a week or so. One other point. Special preachers—are they needed? There are men in this room who can tell us there is a need. But shall these special preachers be recognised? I for one say this, let no man stir from his parish until he obtains the sanction of the bishop. The bishops are ready to a man to lend their names, and give permission to men of experience; and not only give them permission, but a hearty welcome. There is not a bishop who is not ready to licence and to employ a special preacher if he can produce satisfactory testimonials from his friends.

The Rev. R. Rhodes Bristow.

I wish to set before the Congress some of the needs for special preachers which have not yet been touched on, with a view to making the discussion as practical as possible. We have heard of the necessity of them for missions, but besides missions there are other portions of our duty which must not be lost sight of. I mean two points specially—the giving of "instruction" and "conferences." We have too often to lament that the people are not grounded in the faith they profess; but they have not been taught, and they need much teaching. There are many clergy who are not able to give "instructions," which are appeals to the intellect rather than to the heart or conscience, and special preachers could be employed to set before the minds of the people in this way special points of the faith. Then there are "conferences." Who has not heard of conferences in Paris, and elsewhere on the Continent? And who has listened to Canon Liddon's afternoon sermons at St James', Piccadilly, and not longed for him to preach in the other great cities of our country in the same way? We hear from time to time in London that a city church is doomed, and is to be pulled down; but why should not these churches remain, so that "conferences" could be preached in them by eminent theologians on important matters? Then those churches need not be destroyed, for they would be full. This is no mere theory, for have we not seen the church of St Margaret, Lothbury, filled in the busiest part of the day by merchants and city men to hear the "golden lecture" preached by Henry Melville, and since by Daniel Moore? The merchants and traders of our great cities don't want to

be sceptical, but they want to be instructed; and though ordinary sermons can scarcely be made vehicles for such instruction, "conferences" would be most useful for this purpose. I hope these two points will be kept before us.

The Rev. R. W. Randall.

In taking up this subject, let me say one word in behalf of the parish priest. It will not have failed to come to your notice that some of the best and most valuable men in the Church have broken down because of the burden of mission-work which has been thrown on them in addition to their own regular parochial work. We may, therefore, well ask for the institution of an order of preachers to take mission-work off the hands of the ordinary parish priest. But it may be that the same objection may have occurred to you which occurred to me while one of the former speakers was addressing you, that to set a class of men apart for a special work would tend to narrow their minds. There can be no doubt that there is some danger of this; but in a wisely-ordered society it may well be avoided, and the Cowley fathers have shown singular wisdom in guarding against it. It may surprise some to hear that when I was passing my time in retreat at Cowley, I found in the library a large collection of the lives of Nonconformist ministers; and I do not know that anything has ever moved me more than the history of the inner lives of those men, and of the struggles of their souls in their conversion to God. On another occasion, when I was staying in the House at Cowley, the books read aloud during dinner-time were histories of missions in India conducted by Nonconformists, and the "Life of John Wesley." In this way the minds of the members of that order are influenced by all that is good and earnest even in men differing in some respects widely from themselves. A wise governor of such a society would take care that the studies of the members should not be confined to one class of writers, but should embrace books of all kinds bearing upon the manner of teaching and illustrating the truths which the mission-preachers have to deal with. It may seem strange to some here that such a class of Nonconformist writers as I have mentioned should be studied at Cowley; but it will not seem strange to any who know that those who believe most strongly that the Holy Ghost is pledged by the promise of our Lord to work in the Church of God, are of all others the quickest to recognise the workings of the same blessed Spirit outside the Church through the tenderness of God for all His children.

The Venerable Archdeacon Emery.

It seems to me to be an important point that on this subject we have, as it were, united the different classes of thought in agreeing to the want of this special system of preachers. This want is evidently recognised by the different schools in the Church. All honour is due to those in the Church (and I am sure we are all ready to give it) who have always maintained the importance of preaching. I remember twenty years ago an effort was made to get a college sermon, and it was then said, What do you want with college preaching? Men go to the college chapel for prayers, and that is enough. It may be that a certain school did not then give that attention to preaching which they now do, and it is a matter of congratulation and thanksgiving that now the various schools of thought in the Church alike recognise the

importance of supplementing the work of the parochial clergyman by the special preacher. There can be no doubt that those who can preach are worried to death by applications from all parts of the country. I am no great preacher myself, but the number of noes I am obliged to give is alarming; for I could not do anything else, if I accepted all the invitations to preach that I receive. The more you try to reach all classes, the more you find out that you want this kind of help. There is the pastoral as well as the preaching gift; and it is most important if we can, under the authorisation of the Bishop, to get men who can preach to help and supplement the pastor's work. There are a great many of our clergy who have the advantage of being trained to special preaching, and they preach all the better for it; therefore if there is provided a distinct body of men, who could take a parish for a week or so at a time, and let these preachers go somewhere else, much good may be done in the way of exchanging, and by giving the power to the parochial clergy to get away from their parishes for a week or so. That would, I think, also go far to meet the objection one hears occasionally of a clergyman who is said to have stopped too long in his parish, and that his people are looking for the time when he will have a successor. I am most delighted that all schools of thought are agreed on the point, but we do not wish to rush forward too fast. If the Bishops will take it in hand—the movement may be made a most important and yet safe one. I do trust that the speeches made to-night will lay the foundation of a system that will help forward the Church to do what she can to reach, if possible, all classes of the people in this country.

The Chairman.

We seem to have, I think, a warrant for such a class of men as is suggested, in Holy Scripture; for St Paul, of whose baptism such great things are said, so that he could not possibly regard that sacrament as a secondary matter, nevertheless exercised specially the office of herald, and was sent to preach the gospel, not to baptize. What we want also is a supplementary body of preachers and evangelists—the latter may be in minor orders, with a limited authority to deal with a certain range of subjects. I think one part of those in holy orders might be employed to supplement the parochial work of the other part; and considerable advantage might be derived if we appointed men to the diaconate at twenty-one instead of twenty-three years of age, for then they would have more training. What we want is more theological training, and training in the art of teaching. The regular ministry does not seem to satisfy the demands on the Church, without some supplementary aid, and the employment of special preachers will be most helpful.

FRIDAY MORNING, 8th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took the Chair at a quarter-past Ten o'clock.

PERSONAL HOLINESS AS INFLUENCING CONDUCT IN THE FAMILY.

The Right Rev. the President.

By an almost invariable rule, in the performances of the "Messiah" the audience mark their reverence by standing during the Hallelujah Chorus. In the same spirit it has always been felt that reverence for this morning's subject will teach us to abstain from outward demonstrations. Our aim to-day is to draw nearer to God. The speakers desire most earnestly to humble themselves before Him. They must not have their minds disturbed by the praise of men. The grace of God, we trust, will work in the hidden man of the heart. May His still small voice speak to the conscience of us all. May His word be hidden in our hearts. May His Holy Spirit so bless the words spoken to-day, that they may move us to thoughts too deep for utterance, and approbation too heartfelt for applause.

PAPERS.

Earl Nelson read the following paper:—

It is easy to trace in the history of all nations a natural inward longing after a higher and a better life in the mind of man—bearing witness to the Scripture truth that God created man after His own likeness (Gen. i. 26). St Paul clearly bears witness to this "feeling after God" (Acts xvii. 27-29), and shows the way in which the minor revelations of God as the Creator and Dispenser of all earthly blessings have ever had a tendency to draw men unto Him (Acts xiv. 17; Rom. viii. 19–22).

In us, who have been made "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven," this natural longing after holiness, witnessed to, moreover, by the heathen in all their old philosophies and schemes of religion, should be greatly intensified and quickened. For to us God has vouchsafed a fuller revelation of Himself, not only as a loving, true, and holy God, but as the Perfect Truth—the Perfect Love—the Perfect Purity, from whence all truth, all love, and all purity must proceed, and to which Eternal Source all that is holy, and loving, and true, must return, even as the dew and rain return to the clouds again to continue

their beneficent work of watering and fertilising the earth. And so in like manner with all the other attributes of God that have been revealed to us; for all honour, and wisdom, and power, and beauty, and order, and peace, have their source and origin in Him, the Perfection of All.

Now God has been thus revealed to us (1) in His Holy Word; (2) by the teaching and example of our blessed Lord Himself; (3) by the example of the blessed Virgin and all the saints who have gone before us, or who are now living in our midst, and who all in their degree, shining by the borrowed light of His glory, point the way to Him; a true Jacob's ladder reaching up from earth to heaven in various degrees of access, leading us on in the way of holiness into a more perfect likeness of our God. In the work of this cloud of witnesses we are permitted to have a share; for the nearer we approach to the perfect image of God, the greater will be our influence for good to all around us; and more especially so in our family relationships. For the love of the father or the mother or the child are but offshoots of the Eternal love, and each one in their several relationships, if they only seek through His appointed means to draw near to Him, will be permitted to draw from the eternal Source of all love and truth and purity some rays of warmth and light wherewith to reflect His goodness upon all among whom they dwell, and thus to do their part to further His kingdom.

As we have been able to show a natural universal desire, more or less strongly developed, for a return to that perfection in which we were first created, so may we claim the same universal witness to the importance of the institution of family life, in all its love and purity and truth, as the foundation of all the greatness of a nation. I will take only one example. In the best and purest days of Rome, marriage was very highly esteemed. The wife presided over the whole household, educated the children, watched over and preserved the honour of the house, and as *materfamilias* she shared the honour and respect shown to her husband. And even where concubinage was permitted, the ties and purity of family life were preserved by the honour given to the acknowledged wife, and by the chasteness of her character. But when luxury came over the nations, the marriage tie became invariably weakened, and as a certain consequence the whole social fabric was undermined and the nation tottered to its fall. Even Horace bears witness that the first outpouring of corruption in the Roman Empire began from this source.

> "Fecunda culpæ sæcula nuptias
> Primum inquinavere et genus et domos
> Hoc fonte—derivata clades
> In patriam populumque fluxit."
>
> *Hor. Od.* Lib. III. sec. 6, line 17.

I need hardly refer to the Mosaic law to show that the preservation and purity of family life was the one basis upon which the young nation was to be built up as a living witness to the truth of the One Jehovah as He had revealed Himself unto them.

So much is the importance of family life witnessed to in the history of all nations, that I venture to assert that, not only in the intimate relations of family life is the battle for the truth more crucial and earnest than in the individual heart or in the world at large, but that the maintenance of the institution of family life in its purity is of the greatest importance

as a bulwark against the infidel attacks by which we are menaced on every side.

How much more should this purity of family life be secured and maintained among those who call themselves Christians, typifying as it does the union between Christ and His Church, and the perfection and completeness of the whole body of Christ, after the model of the highest and purest family relationships. And yet so completely, as in the times of Rome's decadence, are voluptuousness and ease and idleness eating their way into the hearts of our people, that it would be a sham to write upon the influence of a religious life within the family, without first bearing witness to the fearful inroads which infidelity has already made in this great outwork of Christianity. For years the upper classes had kept very much to themselves the accursed privilege of divorce and remarriage, till the time came when this pernicious luxury must be allowed to all. We are reaping in consequence an abundant harvest of corruption.

The luxuriousness of the age makes all living expensive. Money, and not love, becomes with many, even among the principals, the first consideration when contemplating marriage. Divorce is looked upon as a possible contingency ; a convenient adultery with the man they could not afford to marry is too often winked at on all sides. The constraints and mild discipline of married life, with its accompanying duties and blessings, are too often cast to the winds. Children are voted a nuisance, as interfering with the free enjoyment of luxury and pleasure ; and in this manner, in our very midst, the purity of the family is destroyed. Our social fabric is being gradually but surely undermined, and with it the keystone upon which the real greatness and civilisation of the nations is based.

It is against this increasing inroad of infidelity that all good Christians are asked to make a stand, and the interior of the fortress has become the battle-ground.

It is within the family that we shall find the opposing forces for Christ or Antichrist cleverly marshalled the one against the other. One of the first things which the family life does is to wean a man from his own selfishness ; the love of a wife or child must have a tendency that way, even in the most unregenerate, and must for a time succeed. But when family duties are repudiated the old selfishness returns, and the selfishness of the family, as a family against all the world besides, too often becomes an aggravated form of the old individual selfishness, which the first and purest relationships of family life had a direct tendency to supplant.

Again, in a family as amongst themselves there can be very few shams. They know one another too intimately, but this very transparency which removes at once the artificial gloss of worldly life is not all for good, though it is an onward step towards truthfulness for those who desire to profit by it. With the worldling this knowledge, "that there is no good to sham about it," too often leads to the unrestrained indulgence of all evil passions, and they do their best to make their homes a very hell upon earth.

This transparency of the family life should make us, who would witness for Christ, more than ever circumspect in our daily life. It is but too true that a prophet "is without honour in his own house," and the slightest shortcomings, to which all in this world are more or less liable, are magnified fortyfold, and check sadly for a time the influence for good.

When, too, the whole family go about all smirks and smiles to hide the wretchedness within, and to deceive the world for their own aggrandisement, they do their best to counteract that truthfulness which family life rightly used would naturally help them to cultivate.

Then of course the members of a family from their near contact are subjected to special trials of temper, jealousy, envy, and the like. They have also special trials of sorrow or of joy, and as all these are rightly or wrongly borne, an advance is made towards good or evil in the character of each member of the family, to be again reflected for good or evil in the future life of the family itself.

These considerations exhibit family life as the true battlefield between Christ and Antichrist, a school of discipline to bring us nearer unto God, a fire of temptation by which the souls of individual members are purified and strengthened for their onward course. In a word, each family is in itself a branch of the Church militant, in which every member may be trained for his Master's service, and has a battle to carry on, advancing by the help of the very trials that surround him there, surely, if slowly, in the path of holiness ; and certain by so doing, if only as a faithful soldier of his Lord he is determined to persevere, to be a witness for good to all those amongst whom he dwells. As the head of each family, the master is the priest ruling over the church that is in his house. To rule his household well is to rule with mercy and judgment, neither too strictly or with too much laxity. It is always a difficult position to do well in, and requires much careful consideration and much earnest prayer.

There is little fear of too much strictness now. The worldly infidel spirit has made too great an inroad into the interior of family life among us to leave unsullied the dutiful obedience, under stricter discipline, for which a holy family was generally distinguished in times gone by.

I will not, however, allow that this is altogether a loss to the cause of holiness. There is nothing so hurtful as unreality—as a ruling by fear which militates against truthfulness—or a judging of others by one's self, and a consequent endeavour to force upon them a holiness of life that would be to them artificial, and to which perchance the head of the family had not himself attained till late in life.

A consistent Christian life on the part of master or mistress will do more than stereotyped rules and too strict a discipline. For if a man is aware of his own shortcomings, and of God's unapproachable perfections, he will have learnt somewhat of God's mercifulness, and will bear with others patiently as God is bearing with him ; and the more he perseveres in the way of holiness, the more will he gain true power in his family from the shining forth in his daily life of some of the perfections of his God.

But even in the case of a worldly father, given wholly to selfishness and sin, God is not left without a witness. There is no room for "despair" in the Christian vocabulary. For the very trials and temptations, by which we are surrounded, tend to build up in the family that very witness for God which without such trials would perchance never have been there at all, or would at least have shone there with a flickering, uncertain flame.

Thus we often find a mother's earnest prayers—a mother's patient suffering, from the depth of her great love for husband or children, that may be the cause of her trial—doing their silent work. How often, too, does a mother's sympathy and forbearance counteract the evils of a father's un-

governed wrath, or a mother's self-denying life entirely take away the bad effects of a father's evil example.

Again, to take even a worse case—where the father and mother have "sold themselves to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord." If by God's mercy there are any children there, it is seldom that God is left without a witness. The most wicked are often checked in their course from the fear of leading their children into sin; and how often, when all else is going wrong, is the yearning of a brother's or a sister's love made the means of bearing some witness for good in a family which the devil's work has so completely defaced from its original truthfulness, and purity, and love.

But we may go one step further. The servants of a family have their own responsibilities with the rest, and may help, by the leavening influence of a true witness for Christ, in building up the different members of the family in the way of holiness. There are cases, happily not so few and far between, where a true daughter of Israel (2 Kings v. 2) has been the one witness for God in the family, and has brought them all out of the very depths of sin by a patient continuance in well-doing.

And then there is the quiet, silent witness of innocence and of suffering.

Have you not often been well-nigh overwhelmed by the contemplation of the many families, dwelling in street upon street of our mighty cities, apparently without God in the world? till the bright thought came to cheer you that in the worst of them God could speak by trials for their good, and that in all of them the faint forth-shadowings of His perfection must enter in, that even in the most hopelessly worldly He had His witness in the little child who, in the midst of its misery or sinfulness, must at times witness by its simplicity to some of that truthfulness, and purity, and love which it draws from the Source of all goodness. Thus we see peace may enter even into the most miserable of families.

But we have not yet done with the consideration of family life as a school of discipline for the perfection of the Christian character in all its members. A family is a church in itself, with its hidden trials of sorrow or of joy with which the world intermeddleth not, and of course these must be much more intensely felt and must be of more frequent occurrence than any national adversities or national blessings. There is, in fact, a good deal of truth conveyed in the trite saying that there is a skeleton in every house. Yet this special trial that every family has to endure is sent in itself as a messenger from on high, even though it appear to be but "a messenger of Satan to buffet us," to work out in us more clearly and surely God's perfect work, to lead us on in the way of holiness; and it will be well for those called upon by God to be a witness for Him, whether it be father or mother, or brother or sister, or servant or child, to make friends with these trials, and to work with and through them in the common work to which we are called, and for the furthering of which they are sent upon us.

Wherever the witness for Christ is fairly established, it must leaven the family in which it is set working. It may be that those thus striving may be permitted to see the success of their labours in this life. It may be that striving thus patiently onward they may never know how near they have themselves been brought to the likeness of their God,—or how far they may have brought the family with whom they dwell onward in the way of holiness. It may be that the witness of their own death is needed to

win back some dear lost one that he may carry on henceforth the true witness for Christ in the world which the faithful servant of his Lord has been called upon to lay down.

The end is sure, for the trials and struggles of this Christian warfare are ever blessed for the perfecting the work they at times appear to be hindering. Who does not know how a father's premature death has strengthened the son in an earnest endeavour after holiness, in order that he may the better supply the father's place to the widowed mother, or at all events, to take care that she shall not be vexed by any troubles that he or his brothers and sisters can save her from? Who does not know how often a mother's loss has called forth a daughter to walk more earnestly in the way of holiness, a comfort to the father in his bereavement, a mother to the desolated family? Who does not know what the death of a beloved child has done, over and above a father's teaching or a mother's love, in keeping loving brothers and sisters, though much older than he, from a reckless course of sin, lest perchance they find themselves at the last unfit to share again in the joys of that short, bright life, which has ever given to them that remain a lively foretaste of heaven? So in God's various ways does He lead us on, not in our own strength but in His, not in ways of our own choosing but in His ways, which we at the time understood not.

In drawing this paper to a close, let me say a word to those who have been brought under the beneficent influences of family life, and who from carelessness or from a deliberate course of worldliness are, like Esau, despising their birthright (Heb. xii. 16, 17), and enrolling themselves on the side of the Evil One in the great battle daily carried on within the sacred and beloved precincts of that family life which they recognise by the loving name of Home. There are few so reckless as knowingly to profane the purity of their home-life by bringing their licentiousness to bear upon any member under the family roof, or openly to sully family life by licentious talking or profaneness. But to resist the feeble influences for good is itself a harm to their own morality, and militates against the peace and happiness of family life, "for where anger and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work." The family to all of us, whatever rank of life we belong to, must be our place of trial, where, by a consistent Christian course, we may become a blessing to all around us, and where, on the other hand, a life of worldliness and sin, of unbridled temper and evil example, must do an immense amount of harm to those whom we truly love more than all the world besides. Let us then not be weary in well-doing, but be strong and of a good courage. Knowing that by an early resolve to be on the Lord's side we shall be best furthering Christ's kingdom upon earth and doing His will. For to draw down into the daily life of every family some sparks of the Eternal Purity, the Eternal Truth, the Eternal Love, will be to propagate the true principles of love to God and love to man, and to diffuse the blessings of a true Christian civilisation, not only upon our own Church and nation, but through them upon all the kingdoms of the world.

The Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead.

Personal holiness, as influencing conduct in the family, touches on the right hand and the left the most sacred of things divine and human. If all saints are a royal priesthood, the saint in his home exercises some of the loftiest functions of his office. He does not require to leave the precincts of the temple, but only to pass and repass from the outer to the inner courts of the great sanctuary. For, as we ourselves are holy and grow in holiness, we draw ever nearer the heart of God; and, as we are true to Him in our homes, we draw nearer the hearts of those made in the image of God. We move here altogether in the element of love.

Personal holiness consists in union with Christ, in likeness to Christ, in living for Christ. It is the work of the Holy Ghost in man, and is thus a real though imperfect reflex of the Supreme Beauty of the Holiest. Now beauty is not only a joy to the pure in heart. It is this—

> "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever:
> Its loveliness increases: it will never
> Pass into nothingness"—

but more than this, beauty is power. It is a vital force. And if, in the language of Moses' prayer, "the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us," then will His glory appear to our children, and He will prosper and establish the work of our hands.

It is what we are that tells on all with whom we associate, but most immediately on those of our own homes. And in the truest sense we are what our walk with God is. This is the testimony alike of experience and of revelation.

The vivid photographs of family life in Scripture may be said to commence with Abraham, the father of the faithful. Now, it is remarkable that no sooner are we introduced to the biography of that noble, whole-hearted patriarch, than we are presented side by side with fragmentary sketches of another who also at first confessed himself a pilgrim, but whose temporising worldly conformity involved him and his in bitterest loss and shame.

Abraham and Lot went forth together from Ur of the Chaldees. The visions and oracles vouchsafed to Abraham were doubtless communicated by him to his friend. They worshipped at the same altars. They both endured the trials of Egypt. For three or four years they abode together. But their possessions multiplied; and Lot could not stand the searching test of prosperity. The fertility of the well-watered valley of Jordan overcame every other consideration, and he chose for his residence the guilty cities of the plain.

For a time all things apparently went well with him. His flocks and herds were pastured in the richest fields. His household increased. His children intermarried with the people of the land. For many years earth showered her best upon him. But, as St Peter testifies, his soul was downtrodden and troubled (καταπονούμενος). It was a daily torment to him (ἐβασάνιζεν). He does not appear to have altogether hidden his pilgrim character for the wicked men who assaulted him said, "This one

came in to sojourn." Perhaps, as crime after crime came to his knowledge, Lot was wont to say, "I cannot endure it any longer, I must be gone." Nor was he personally defiled with the abominations of the land; for the testimony of Scripture is express that he was himself a just and righteous man. But we know how inexpressibly mournful was the issue of his choice. The time of retribution came. There was the sore message of impending destruction: there was the night of terror: there was the agony of repulse by his kindred: there was the monument of judgment in his wife. He himself barely escaped; and the lamp of his earthly life went out in obscure darkness.

Is not this the spiritual history of many a professedly Christian family? The parents have, or one of the parents has, the germs of true faith. The root of the matter is in them or in one of them. But with a view to temporal advantages—more they say for their children's sake than for their own—they tamper and mingle with the world, that world which, notwithstanding all the refinements of this nineteenth century, still lies in wickedness. Its fascination grows stronger and stronger. Their soul is vexed. But they hush disquietude. They try to persuade themselves that a neutral course is needful for them. Their case, they plead, is exceptional; and the time, they hope, will yet arrive for a bolder confession of Christ. In how many cases that golden season is never found. The end comes; and the parents, if they are Christ's, are saved, yet so as by fire. But the work of their lives is irretrievably lost. And their children and their households, where are they? Alas! the vacant positions in the Church of Christ, which crave the patient workman and the faithful warrior, knows them not. In these days of prevalent secularism the Church mourns her recreant sons and daughters. And is not the secret cause the lack in many of those parents and heads of families, who profess and call themselves Christians, of a high standard of personal holiness?

We turn, then, to the brightly contrasted course of Abraham. He walked by faith. He never attempted to return to Chaldea. He would never exchange his tent for a mansion. He avowedly surrendered the seen for the unseen, the temporal for the eternal. He walked with God. God was his shield and his exceeding great reward. He openly confessed Whose he was and Whom he served. Wherever he tarried he set up the altar of prayer and praise. He insisted on the observance of family religion. He commanded his children and his household after him to keep the ways of the Lord. He came out and was separate from the world. There was indeed all the courtesy of an eastern sheikh in his dealings with others. There was the acquirement and the enjoyment of wealth. There was a wise forethought in the guidance of his nomad tribe. But there was a broad line of demarcation between him and the inhabitants of Canaan. He would not own a footbreadth of the soil, save that which he bought for a burying-place. And when he would seek a wife for Isaac, though he might doubtless have allied himself with the noblest of the children of Heth, who said, "Thou art a mighty prince among us," Abraham threw himself on God to provide a faithful partner for the son of his old age. In this obedience of faith, though not unblemished by human frailties, he persevered to the end. And the result of his piety is seen in the godliness of his family. Eliezer, his

steward, was a man of prayer. Isaac trod in his father's footsteps. From generation to generation it was a household of faith. From age to age the stream of blessing deepened and broadened. And eternity alone will reveal the influence of that one man's exalted personal holiness.

We, as Christian believers, live in the clearer light of the gospel covenant, a covenant sealed to each one of us in baptism, and continually ratified in the Holy Supper. If we are Christ's, not in name only, but in deed and in truth, the promises made to Abraham are fulfilled to us and to our children. By our sacramental oath we are sworn soldiers of the cross, which Abraham saw only afar off in type and shadow. We have again and again offered and presented ourselves, soul and body, as a living sacrifice to God, constrained by a more transparent manifestation of His love than Abraham ever knew. We are strangers and sojourners on the earth in a deeper meaning than attached to the pilgrim character, before the Word was made flesh and tabernacled among men. We not only, like the patriarchs, look for a city which hath foundations and a heavenly fatherland; but in the person of our Emmanuel God hath raised us up together with Him and made us sit together in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus. And we are living under the economy of the Holy Spirit, which our ascended Lord according to His sure promise hath poured forth upon His disciples. To us much more has been given than to Abraham. From us much more will be required. And surely it is not unworthy of the closing session of our Church Congress to ask, Are we in our homes, where our truest selves appear, walking answerably to our Christian calling and as becometh the children of light?

The secret life with God will make itself felt in the daily life of home. Yea, just in proportion as the hidden life to Godward is real and intense, will the apparent life among others be consistent and true. It is not too much to say that every hour spent in communion with God, every fresh grasp of His Holy Word, every glad anticipation of our Lord's return in glory, every view vouchsafed us of the kingdom of His love—meditations the most sacred, and exercises the most recluse—have a direct bearing on our conduct in the family circle. The influence of these things is discernible in the chastened cheerfulness of the demeanour, in the tones of the voice, in the very play of the countenance. His family cannot but take knowledge of the saint that he has been with Jesus. This personal saintliness diffuses its fragrance in every station of life, whether found in husband or wife, parent or child, master or servant, it is like the perfume in the right hand which bewrayeth itself. But if the one who thus walks with God be at the head of a family, the whole house is quickly filled with the odour of the ointment. The influence is felt not only in the solemn reading of God's Word, and in the devout prayers and praises offered morning and evening at the family altar, not only in the delightful observance of the Lord's day as a holy day of resurrection joy, nor only in such an arrangement of domestic duties as shall allow every one to worship in God's house and at Christ's table; but it will pervade the spirit in which the business of the home is conducted, the conversation at meal times, the favourite amusements cultivated, the choice of schools, and of their after walk in life for children, the friendships sought and the alliances made. Surely it is not too much to ask that "Holiness unto the Lord"

should be manifestly engraven upon every part of that life which we have given without reserve to God.

And then, if our children and servants and the inmates of our homes cannot but observe that the things of God are first in our esteem, that we are very jealous of our God's time and for God's cause and glory, that we sit loose to the world's favour, that our eye is more intent on the promotion of Christ's kingdom than on any personal advancement, that our treasure and heart are in heaven, that our citizen life is there, and that we look for and love the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ—these things being realities must tell on those with whom we are in daily contact. And if they further note that our religion makes us diligent in our calling, cheerful under the nameless little crosses of life, patient under provocation, quick to sympathise with all things true and honourable, bold to rebuke sin, calm and collected in times of peril, and sustained with heavenly consolations when none but God can comfort, they must confess the power of this beauty of holiness. They will glorify not us but our Father who is in heaven. For, as an old writer says, the wax-taper when lighted casts a comely shadow round itself, while it sheds a gentle radiance on every object round about it.

If this seems to refer especially to parents and heads of families, it is true relatively of every other member of the house. Joseph in Potiphar's house, Ruth a stranger and a widow, the little Israelitish maid of Naaman's wife, the captive stripling Daniel in Nebuchadnezzar's palace, the children upon whom Jesus smiled, Mary, of whom He said, She hath done what she could, Onesimus the converted slave—these and countless others in the annals of the Church testify the power of holiness in the humble. Those members of the mystical body of Christ, who seem to be more feeble, are necessary, yea, as necessary to its completeness as the eye or ear, or hand or foot. "Most men," it has been said, "overrate their talents, and underrate their influence." The waters wear the stones; and the constant continuance in well-doing, whereby the true disciples of Jesus seek for glory and honour and immortality—a pursuit ever pointing us heavenward—seems almost to echo the words of the spirit in Milton's "Comus"—

> "To the ocean now I fly,
> And those happy climes that lie,
> Where day never shuts his eye,
> Up in the broad fields of the sky. . . .
> Mortals, that would follow me,
> Love Virtue: she alone is free:
> She can teach ye how to climb
> Higher than the sphery chime;
> Or if Virtue feeble were
> Heaven itself would stoop to her."

This at least we may hope, that the very consideration of our subject this morning, the details of which will be more elaborated in the following papers, will lead many of us to return to our homes, asking our own consciences whether we have been true to our Lord and to ourselves in time past; and if our heart condemn us praying for grace that we may "set our house in order" before the night falls. This we may be assured of, the influence of personal holiness does not die with the dying saint. In how many homes, where the voice of the venerated father, or of the tender, saintly mother, or even the pious child, has long been hushed in

death, the quiet, silent power of their holy life governs and ever will govern the thoughts and words and conduct of those who are left. A good man leaveth the inheritance of his goodness to his children's children. It is a priceless heirloom. And all its preciousness, transmitted from age to age and multiplied in countless hearts by the power of the Holy Spirit, will not be known till the whole family is gathered together in the many mansions of Our Father's House.

The Rev. H. Montagu Villiers, M.A., Rector of Adisham, Kent.

Whether the family life, as contrasted with that technically called "the religious," is the highest state of Christian grace and perfection, as asserted by the author of the "History of Latin Christianity," is a question which would probably be answered very differently by different members of this Congress, but upon this, at all events, we shall, I think, be agreed, that for most men the family life is, or should be, the scene of Christian discipline and the field of Christian practice. Hence the deep importance of the subject under consideration; but the subject is a very wide one, and in dealing with it I intend to confine myself to a single point, viz., personal holiness in its influence on those around us in family life.

With this question then before us, I must first of all point out as lying at the very root of the matter, that if, in the close intimacy of family life there is such an influence exercised by any one, the man or woman who exercises it must be *real*. Hypocrisy, unreality in any form, breaks down here; reality alone makes itself felt. We know the old saying that "no man is a hero to his valet." I dispute the universal truth of this—it would be true of a Beau Brummell, the brilliant sham—it would be untrue of a Sir Thomas More, pre-eminently "a man in whom there was no guile"—rather you will find that a consistent Christian man is the greatest hero to those who know him best. This was true of our blessed Lord—it was the world who "knew Him not"—it was one of the innermost circle who testified that he had seen the "excellent glory," and what is true of the Master is true of the disciple, just so far as he, like the Master, is intensely *real*. Perhaps we have wondered often at the little influence exercised at home over husband, or wife, or children, or servants by those admitted to have influence and power abroad. Believe me, too often unreality lies at the root of the failure. A man need not be as false as the "Strass Engel Haus Teufel" of the German proverb, to lose all influence at home—it is sufficient that the home circle knows him not to *be* what he likes to seem—and of how many is this true! not perhaps from that wilful hypocrisy which deliberately seeks to deceive others, but from that most deadly of all deception which makes a man at last the willing dupe of self, till he forgets that he is not necessarily what he says, nor even what he does, *though he is what he thinks*—and we may be well assured that in the close intimacy of home-life our very thoughts are read by those around us, and *there* at least unreality stands forth "a guilty thing detected." Outside religion may influence to some extent an

outside world, but it will miserably break down inside the home. Not without reason does David tell us, "I will walk in my house with a perfect heart," *before* he passes on to lay down rules for household management, and to say that no deceitful person shall dwell in his house, nor the liar tarry in his sight. Yet reality does not preclude mistakes, no, nor even inconsistencies; St Peter was not always consistent, but St Peter was very real. Every grace, and reality amongst others, is nurtured amidst failure, but nevertheless I lay it down as a first principle in our inquiry that *the soul of home influence is reality.*

Let us now pass on to inquire how personal holiness, with all its reality, may be most influentially brought to bear upon others, and in so doing we must recognise the fact that the position of most bears a two-fold character. Over some *we are placed in authority*, towards others our *obedience is due.* We will keep then this our two-fold position before us, and consider *first*, the influence which the personally holy should exercise from a position of authority over others—no unimportant question when we remember how the Friend of God was himself specially taught, because the Omniscient could declare that he would "rule his household after him" in accordance with the divine law—no unimportant question when we recall the fate of that old man whose sons "made themselves vile, and he restrained them not."

We will speak first of the legitimate scope or range of such influence, and then of the manner of its exercise. Its range is of course a wide one. St Bernard lays down three distinctive marks of a Christian household, and they are these,—*Sanctitudo*, *Modestia*, and *Honestas*, which I think we may express by *Godliness*, *Holy Fear*, and *Strict Propriety*, and on each of these the influence of the authorities in a family must be brought to bear.

On the godliness of the family, not only with reference to the attention of the various members to their more public religious duties in accordance with the rules of the Church, or in the conduct of family worship where the head of the family will execute that true priesthood which is his by virtue of his membership in the body of Christ, but in the matter of private devotion, also, it is most important that those in authority—and indeed all those who cultivate personal holiness—should make no secret of the times and hours given by themselves to private devotion and meditation; it is the greatest help to those commencing to strive after a higher life to know that there are those under the same roof who live by rule, and who at certain hours will day by day be found upon their knees or be engaged in the study of God's Word. Under this head too we are reminded of the duty, so commonly overlooked, of instructing in the great truths of the Christian religion those whose tender years or early life of service may render it more specially needful.

Again, *Holy Fear*, as pervading the family life, must be duly fostered by inculcating respect for all authority ecclesiastical and civil (the powers that be are ordained of God), and also for all to whom honour is due; but, above all, by the maintenance of that reverential tone which should accompany the belief in God's continual presence, and the realisation of the proximity of the vast spirit-world around us, and which will ever guard against (especially in so-called religious conversation) the most distant approach to irreverent familiarity where holy things are concerned,

remembering and enforcing the old Latin precept "Sanctus, Sancta, Sancte tractat," while lastly—

Strict Propriety, the "Honestas" of St Bernard, will bring under influence as far as may be the style of living, the books and newspapers which are read, the intimacies formed, the social manner, and not least in the present day, the DRESS of the various members of the family, and when I say "as far as may be," I do not mean the expression to cover carelessness in supervision, but that such influence should be used as by one obeying the injunction "He that ruleth with diligence," or as he of whom the Son of Sirach speaks so touchingly when he tells us, "The father waketh for his daughter when no man knoweth, and his care for her taketh away his sleep," as one who obeys the loving counsel, "if thou hast a servant let him be to thee as thyself."

I have so far endeavoured briefly to sketch the *scope* of the influence of the personally holy when in a position of authority, but I hurry on to speak of *the manner of its exercise*. Now, I admit that obedience lies at the root of family government; this St Paul plainly shows us, bidding "wives be subject," "children obey," "servants be obedient;" and where there is obedience there must be command. It has been most truly said that one-half of the beauty and grandeur of paternity consists in the firmness which denies itself the pleasure of tenderness unrestrained, but, while the influence given by a position of authority must sometimes find its expression in command, yet pure influence should be more trusted than it often is. Let us remember that the government of a family should not be a tyranny—*mere dogmatism and self-assertion must not be mistaken for government* (would that this were not so often forgotten),—moreover, if it be true that the man of influence is he who rather says "Come" than "Go," there will be no surer way of exacting obedience from others than by yielding it one's self where obedience is due. Let the rulers themselves recognise, and let others see that they recognise rule. Let their own daily life proclaim, "I also am a man under authority," and then their own influence will be felt. It is more than a guess at truth which tells us that "while the virtue of paganism was strength, the virtue of Christianity is obedience," and it is for want of recognising this truth, that, while power and coercion is often exercised, influence is so often lost. There is nothing in which the Catholic system developes itself more beautifully than in the opportunity which it gives those in highest authority in the household to show how they themselves live under the obligation of the Church's rule, and that they exact no more from others than they are willing themselves to pay. Not without reason did St Paul, with such particularity, command, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." The great Catholic principle of order lies here, and will be found at the root of influence. With what countenance, for example, can a man enforce the three rules of St Bernard, who himself needlessly neglects the call of the household, the Church, to daily worship, and despises the Church's rule of festival and fast? The mere Protestant may lay down the law in his own house, and may, by sheer force, maintain conformity to his ruling amidst the individual protests of his family; it is the logical outcome of his system. He may, and usually does, constitute himself a pope, and his family will mentally reject his infallibility as too great a triumph over family history; but he who alone can be said

to influence the rule of life of those around him is the man who is himself obedient.

And the same principle may be applied to opinion as to practice. The Roman and the Puritan alike have shown their weakness in the oft-repeated attempt to coerce the minds of others to a forced agreement with their own. The *true* spirit of Catholicity, on the other hand, is content simply to teach in love, believing in the inherent power of truth. Now there is no *primâ facie* reason why the wife and elder children should necessarily hold the same opinions, religious, social, or political, as the father—though it *may* be a happy thing if it is so—but let this conformity be insisted on and the result is one of two things, either *submission*, and death to thought, with its consequent destruction of all individuality and repudiation of responsibility, or *resistance*, accompanied by domestic warfare and its attendant misery.

The truest influence in religious opinion as in religious practice will usually be exercised by one who, having himself intelligently accepted the Church's teaching, commends it *lovingly* to others, backed, as he is, by an authority greater than his own. God has allowed to man the exercise of his freewill, and what He expects from the personally holy is intelligent co-operation with Himself in their influence over others, and not despotic rule; there is a sacredness in individuality of character which must not be profaned.

But passing from the exercise of influence by those in authority, I must speak of the influence which the personally holy should exercise simply as individual members of Christ on those both above and below them. I must go straight to the point, and ask how comes it that such influence which ought to be so great is so continually at fault? And I answer *first* (granting as before reality), *from failing to recognise the importance of* the sphere in which that influence is to be exercised, from failing, I mean, to realise the fact which we have readily admitted, that "home is to most *the* scene of Christian discipline, *the* field of Christian practice." We look for our work beyond it, forgetting that saintliness is to be found in filling our own place perfectly, and that for many the position at home is the place they have to fill, for rightly filling which they will have to give account, and so we overlook the fact that that unsympathising partner, that ill-tempered sister, that selfish brother, that irritable parent, is not only the very trial which God has specially allowed to cross our path, but the very object on which He expects us to use our influence, and the influencing of whom is perhaps given to us as our main work in life.

Secondly, from underrating the difficulty of the task. It is not by a spasmodic holiness, but by "patient continuance in well-doing," that we gain influence, and we are apt to ignore the fact that patience under family provocation is often more wonderful than that of a martyr at the stake. The one is the marvel of an hour, the other is the miracle of a life. It really is a kind of miracle to walk day by day with equal step, to do with the same care and attention to-morrow that which we did yesterday, and so on to our life's end, yet only so far as we are consistent through long days and hours shall we influence others. We underrate the difficulty and we fail.

Thirdly.—The ruin of the influence of many is the common mistake of *seeking influence rather by what we do and say than by what we are.* Yes,

failure in influence is failure in self. I know that it is possible to be morbid and to abuse this truth by shutting *one's self* in, and one's social duties *out*, possible to study one's own feelings till we become the victims of a sort of chronic inflammation of the conscience, but I know that the really influential are those who bear about with them what the Père Gratz has so beautifully called "the mighty power of a humble heart which leans on God and of a thoughtful soul which drinks deep of Him." Cultivate this by recollection and retirement, by lonely thought and private prayer, and you need not seek for influence—you have it—for every such life is in itself a power, or rather in such a life you will find three powers developed :—

1. The power, and an immense power it is, of respecting feelings and opinions in others which we do not share or even perhaps fully understand —a great source of influence this.

2. *The power of meekness* (which we are so slow to recognise), so great because it makes us so like our Lord and brings us so close to God; it is ever the meek who inherit the earth, in other words, who influence others.

3. *The power of unselfish love.*—Yes, a loving heart has more influence than a clever head, the power of one who has recognised the deep truth of the Jewish taunt, "He saved others, Himself He cannot save," and who means to save others despite the cost to self. Three powers which witness to the eternal truth, that just in so far as men and women die to self they will really influence others.

Have we not known such, and knowing them have we not felt the tremendous power of their quiet influence on their countenance? The love of God sparkling, and the very glory of God resting, on their brow—they live, ever giving contradiction to the devil's lie, that godliness and gloom are identical—ever throwing a heavenly halo around the most ordinary scenes of homely life, and proving that there is no single earthly enjoyment worthy of the name which godliness does not ten thousand times enhance. Such a one is living a supernatural life. I grant it, but what shall we say of a Christian life which is not supernatural? We did well to consider last night the popular arguments of unbelief and how to meet them, and very valuable were some of the suggestions offered, but there is no such popular argument in favour of *unbelief* as the unchristlike life of men and women who nevertheless profess belief in sacramental union with Him. Too often in the family the greatest stumbling block, not only to a higher life in those around us, but to the *faith* itself, is the contradiction between high profession, combined with high practice in some particulars, and the selfish or ill-tempered life of the professor. "How can I believe," said a poor child once to me, "when my parents return from the early celebration to squabble at the breakfast table?" On the other hand, wherever men so live and so speak, or equally after the example of our blessed Lord, so keep silence that others take notice of them that they have been with Jesus, *there* stands out to be known and read of all men the surest evidence of the truth of Christianity—stands out as I have said with a supernatural power—for every Christlike life is in itself a sacrament, "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace."

PERSONAL HOLINESS AS INFLUENCING CONDUCT IN SOCIETY.

The Dean of Lichfield.

During the last hour much has been said, and well said, upon Personal Holiness as influencing conduct in the Family. It falls to my lot to offer a few thoughts upon Personal Holiness as influencing our conduct in Society.

It seems to me to be important, that we should first settle in our minds what we mean by holiness. The word itself is of somewhat vague and indefinite meaning. In the Hebrew original it contains, as we all know, the idea of separation—separation from other things on account of some excellency. But when we examine the English equivalent we find that it implies a state of soundness or health. And yet holiness is just one of those terms to which the reason and instinct of man seems at once to apply the true and proper meaning. Every one understands what we mean when we speak of a holy person. We mean a person set apart on account of some eminence or excellence bestowed upon him by God. And a very little further consideration will show that personal holiness implies the conscious willing acceptance, on the part of an intelligent creature, of the gift thus vouchsafed; so that it becomes, as it were, a very part of himself, influencing his whole life and conduct. There is, indeed, a difference between our notion of holiness as an attribute of Deity, and our idea of it as acquired by man, through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier. But this difference is, after all, chiefly one of degree. It is nothing more than what necessarily separates the finite from the Infinite—the sinful creature from the sinless Creator. When we speak of the holiness of God, who does not feel that we are speaking of that perfection by which He is set apart, differenced off from all created things. Holiness, as we ascribe it to God, denotes His excellency above all things else, His infinite, supreme, and unapproachable majesty and glory. "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts!"

Now this will help us to understand what we mean by personal holiness in a Christian man. It denotes not merely his separation by God to something excellent and divine; but his own conscious and willing separation of himself under the influence of the Holy Spirit, not indeed from the world (for then must he needs go out of the world), but from the evil that is in the world; and it implies that he is ever aiming at a purity and excellence which shall be some faint reflection of the holiness and excellence of God.

It will, therefore, be evident at once from hence, that the work to which we are called as Christians is no easy one. Our position is indeed very different from that of the primitive Christians. They found themselves a little flock in the midst of heathenism. We are surrounded by those who call themselves Christians. We breathe on every side the atmosphere of a nominal Christianity. How important, then, is it that our conversation should be such as becomes the Gospel of Christ—that we should keep up the high standard of primitive holiness, and be the heralds

of Christ's truth in all our intercourse with others; that we should let our light shine before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify, not us, but our Father who is in heaven. And for this what a mighty instrument is speech. How powerful an engine is the tongue for good, when it is employed for God's glory, and the well-being of those around us. Now, in conversation, as in other things, men are apt to fall into extremes, some with puritanical preciseness exclaiming against the innocent customs of the world, and finding fault with everything; others, under the pretence of avoiding this extreme, flying into the other, and imagining that in order to be agreeable in society we must avoid the mention of religion, and keep our highest destinies out of sight. How rarely do we meet with that wise union of gravity and courteousness, of piety and gentleness, of dignity and humility, which recommends Christianity instead of discrediting it, which enables us to uphold the religion of Jesus without injuring the rights of society, and to do justice to society without dishonouring our religion. For this we need, as the Apostle teaches us, that our speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt (*πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος*). Our words should ever reflect the divine grace which comes down from above; and there should also be in them that purity and freshness, that vital briskness and living energy, which marks the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in man.

If I am asked to particularise, I would say that personal holiness, wherever it really exists, will so influence our conversation that it shall be truthful, and pure, and charitable. First, it will be *truthful*. "Lord, who shall abide in Thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in Thy holy hill? He that speaketh the truth from his heart. He that hath used no deceit in his tongue, nor done evil to his neighbour, and hath not slandered his neighbour." It is with such persons that God is pleased to dwell here; and they shall dwell with Him eternally hereafter. Well; then further, our conversation will be *pure*. We shall be enabled to separate instinctively what is innocent from what is sinful. We shall shrink from even the indirect and covert approaches of vice. We shall with senses well exercised by reason of Christian use, be able to discern between good and evil. Then once more; personal holiness will manifest itself in the *charitable tone* of our conversation in society. I confess I sometimes find it difficult to reconcile with Christian charity much of the conversation of professing Christians. It is, it must be, inconsistent with personal holiness, to build rash censures and bitter reproaches of others upon doubtful conjectures or evil surmises. He who judges or speaks ill of his brethren, ought to be well assured of what he thinks or says. He who asserts as true that which he does not know to be true, is as guilty of falsehood as he who asserts as true what he knows to be false. It is not every possibility, every faint appearance, that is sufficient ground on which to rest a bad opinion of others. For truth is only seen in a very clear light; and "charity thinketh no evil."

There are, I think, few points which are not included in these three requirements of truth, and purity, and charity, There are, however, two cautions of detail which I would venture to suggest, because they appear to me to be of importance, if we, as Christ's disciples, are to exercise our right influence in society.

The first is, to avoid anything like a peculiar religious phraseology in

our conversation. I am convinced that nothing more repels, not only men of the world, but the great mass of average Christians, than the use by religious persons of studied phrases, and artificial modes of expression in their ordinary intercourse with others. Men are apt, though often without any reason, to suspect hypocrisy lurking under them; but with this unfortunate result, that a prejudice is too frequently thus created against religion itself. Simplicity and naturalness of manner is always winning; and it is of special importance when we are trying to recommend Christianity.

My second caution is this; that we guard against flippancy or familiarity in speaking upon religious subjects. Religion, in whatever form it appears, whether it is the religion of our own party or not, should always be treated with reverence; and I know of nothing that would more help to heal our divisions, to subdue party spirit, to promote unity in our Church, and to recommend it to the world, than that Christians of whatever school would recognise those great fundamental truths which we all hold in common, and seek for our grounds of agreement, dealing with all tenderness and charity with our points of difference.

One word more, and I have done. I fear that there are many Christians, well-disposed persons in the main, who nevertheless live much below the true standard, because they dissociate their religious acts, as they are called, from the ordinary pursuits and business of life. They are regular and conscientious in their religious duties, diligent in their private and public devotions; constant, it may be, in receiving the Holy Communion. But somehow they make religion one thing, and their ordinary business another thing. They do not interweave Christianity with the texture of their daily life. Now, what I am anxious to contend for is this, that personal holiness is the condition of the whole Christian life, and not of portions of it only. Look at that bright planet over your head. Mark its retirement from observation, its lowliness, its cheerfulness, its undeviating obedience to the law of its Creator. We know that at every point in its circuit it is influenced by the sun, round which it revolves; and it is that attractive power which restrains it, keeps it in its orbit, prevents it from flying off into unknown space, and working possible injury in its course. So if we would be kept in the path of duty, if we would be kept true to God, we must be attracted to the Sun of Righteousness at every point in our course. Thus shall we be enabled to travel on through worldly business and care with cheerfulness and humility, enlightening the world, and yet living above the world; ever shedding a holy, gentle, and real, though often imperceptible influence, over those amongst whom we move.

While speaking upon this subject I feel painfully conscious how far I fall below my own standard, and how greatly I need the counsel which I presume to offer to others. May it be found in the Day of Christ, that I have not spoken altogether in vain on this occasion, either to myself or to you.

Mr S. A. Blackwood.

The subject of Personal Holiness, as influencing the conduct of Christians in Society, is one of the most important, and at the same time the most difficult, that can engage our attention. It was the declension of personal holiness in their relation to the persons by whom they were surrounded that brought the judgment of God upon the world before the Flood, and the perilous character which is predicted of the last times consists, as I understand it, to a great extent, in the fact that the Church and the world will have become irremediably mingled. The salt will have lost its savour, and there will be no power to stay the rapidly-advancing corruption; the light will have been turned into twilight, or a mixture of light and darkness, and finally to darkness, and then "how great will be that darkness!" It will need the searching light of the presence of the returning Son of God, and the agency of the angels which excel in strength, to distinguish the precious from the vile, and to disentangle the wheat from the tares.

The difficulty of the subject arises, I believe, from a generally inadequate standard of personal holiness, and an indistinct perception of the real character of society.

Let me briefly state what I understand by those terms—

1. *Personal holiness.*—This is of two kinds, objective and subjective.

(*a.*) Objective, as when the vessels of the tabernacle or the Sabbath-day were set apart for God. They were holy vessels: the seventh was a holy day; but no intrinsic change took place in them. Such is the objective holiness of a Christian, who is one set apart for God, one sprinkled with precious blood and holy oil. He is "holy unto the Lord."

(*b.*) Holiness is subjective when the object thus outwardly sanctified is inwardly the recipient of divine power or influence; as, for instance, when the tabernacle was filled with the cloud of the Divine Presence. A Christian is, in that sense, personally holy, when he is not only set apart to God by his calling and profession as a Christian, but when, and in proportion as, he is filled with the Holy Ghost, he is living in close union and communion with God. Such was the personal holiness, as outwardly manifested, of Moses, when his face shone with the glory of the God with whom he had been communing, and of Stephen, when, looking steadfastly up into heaven, "all they that sat in the council saw his face, as it had been the face of an angel."

Such I understand to be personal holiness. Separation unto God, as redeemed by blood from among men—being filled with the Holy Ghost as the temple of God.

2. *What is society.*—The division of subjects assigned to us makes it evident that it is regarded as different from the little world of the family, and the large world of business, whether professional or commercial. It must be something equally distinct from the Church or congregation of faithful men, for it is the conduct of believing men in society which personal holiness is to influence.

I believe I shall not be far wrong in defining society as "the world," or in other words, those surroundings of persons, scenes, and things in which we are placed by the providence of God, and out of which it is

not our unmistakable duty to remove. I do not therefore regard it now as comprising the racecourse, the theatre, or the ball-room, in which (though there may be some of very pure minds, but imperfect apprehension of the dignity of their Christian calling, who can move in them without danger), I cannot for a moment, as once a man of the world, imagine any one with a deep sense of the value of time, the worth of the soul, or the glory of God, taking part. I do not speak of society now as comprising such scenes.

Now, our difficulty here is that, whilst nominally Christian, society, or the world, is still the world, and therefore not of God. It has been baptized, but not converted. It has received a Christian name, but not a new nature. Society, modern society, in which we are placed, and which we cannot help touching at all points, is full of temptation, and is not, as a whole, on the side of, but in opposition to, the Father. It comprises "the lust of the eyes and the pride of life."

How then, being thus placed, will personal holiness influence our conduct.

1. It will not make us monks or nuns. Such was not the example left us by our Saviour; such was not the spirit of His prayer in John xvii.; such was not the character of apostolic precept or example. We are not to be conformed to the world: but we are not to go out of the world.

Neither are we to be ascetics; Christ is to be our example. He could share the festivities of the marriage scene; and I do not believe that there was any moroseness in Him which damped the innocent mirth of the day. He could equally sit, when bidden, at the Pharisee's dinner-table; and yet at both He was about His Father's business, and found opportunities—not forced either—of commending the truth, and manifesting the glory of God.

Jesus was personally holy, and He mixed in the society in which He was placed; but it was as the Light of the world and the salt of the earth. God's glory was not tarnished, but manifested thereby. In this He is to be our example.

2. Personal holiness will lead us to walk circumspectly, redeeming the time. It will make me watchful over my own soul, lest, forgetting my high privileges as an heir of the promises, I descend to the well-watered and attractive plains, and thus lose my own peace and joy, and my influence for good over my family and neighbours. It will make me guard against the soporific effects of the enchanted ground over which I am passing, the air of which tends to make me drowsy; it will make me watch and pray, lest, being surrounded by temptation at every point, I enter into temptation, and will make me seek to keep my garments, which have been washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb, unspotted from the world.

3. Again, the realisation of my personal holiness will afford me a true principle of guidance with regard to the scenes in which I should mix.

As one who is a member of a royal priesthood, I have my hand and foot and ear touched with precious blood, and can neither walk in ways, nor share in works, nor listen to words which partake of the sin from which that blood has redeemed and cleansed me, and to atone for which my Saviour died.

As one who is a temple of the Holy Ghost, I can share in nothing which

grieves Him who lovingly condescended to dwell in my heart and hold my hand. My members are the members of Christ; where He would have gone, I may go with Him. I have never forgotten the advice given to me twenty years ago, when first starting on a Christian course, by a faithful and experienced servant of Christ: Never go anywhere where you cannot ask the Lord Jesus to go with you.

4. Lastly, realisation of my personal holiness to God will enable me to remember that my conduct in society must inevitably influence others, and this will, to a great extent, regulate my conduct. A Christian, as I have noticed, is the salt of the earth, and his presence must exercise a purifying and preserving influence. A Christian is the light of the world, and his presence must detect, make manifest, and reprove the ungodly. A Christian, the prophet tells us, is to be as dew "from the Lord," a gift from heaven to a dry and thirsty world. As such, he should, with face turned towards the Sun of Righteousness, reflect his full-orbed shining in the world. His very presence will be refreshing, even if silent and unobtrusive, and the aching hearts of the sorrowing men will be gladdened and brightened. He will be a witness for God.

Such, so far as time enables me, is my conception of how personal holiness will influence our conduct in society. Not by a set of abstract rules, but by the conscious realisation of the very highest principle, the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit.

Is this too high a standard? Is it not God's? Is it unattainable? Surely not.

> "There are souls that seem to dwell
> Above the earth, so rich a spell
> Floats round their steps where'er they move."

The unconscious influence of a man of God was such that, as he walked, "they brought forth the sick into the streets and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them." May not our shadow, our inseparable and unconscious influence, fall thus on many. May we not, like Moses, bear about with us, though unconsciously, the impression of the glory of God. And then will not converse with God in prayer, communion with Him in His Word, afford us true principles which will make us instinctively wise and holy in all manner of conversation? Fresh from the heights of such communion, the frivolities of modern society will have no more attraction for us than an invitation to join the dance, the song, and the play under the Mount could have had for Moses.

A constant realisation of whose we are and whom we serve will be our safeguard. Our question will not be, How far may I go into sin without perilling my soul, but, How and where can I best advance my Saviour's kingdom. Tables of stone with "Thou shalt not" will not be so much needed. The heart that is filled with the Holy Ghost, and consequently with love to God, will require them no more for its guidance than will the wife whose heart is wholly her husband's need to be reminded continually of her marriage vows.

Looking for and hasting unto the day of God, we shall see what manner of persons we ought to be in all holy conversation and godliness, and be diligent to be found of Him in peace, and blameless, in that society or station of life in which He has placed us.

The Rev. Canon Money.

There is nothing more real than the holiness of a true Christian. The death Christ died is his through faith. The life Christ lived is his also, and now Christ liveth in him. In the consciousness of this resides the believer's happiness and strength, in the manifestation of it his testimony. This holiness is not self-originated. It is imparted. Our appeal lies to history, and to the lives of men to the present day, against the idea that holiness can exist apart from God's truth. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, that liveth and abideth for ever." When we consider the consequences of sin, and its fearful ravages—when we feel its awful power and soul-destroying influence, then is the contrast most striking as the Word of God unfolds to us the beauty of holiness, the glory which Christ's perfect character displays, and the fruits of righteousness. Think what the world was, what the world would now be, without Christ. Imagine London deprived of all Christian teaching, example, and influence. Take away its hospitals, asylums, benevolent institutions, and charities. Leave science its halls, the materialist his atom, the secularist his school, the infidel his club, society its fashions, pleasures, and heart-burnings.

What would be the result? Who can think of such a catastrophe and not shudder? "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong to thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes for ever." A lost city, a lost soul! But it was to a lost world that God sent His Son. It is to a lost world that Christ sends His messengers. It is in a lost world that the Church of Christ dwells, and travails, and suffers. As it was in Judea in the days of apostles and martyrs, even so is it now in England, in this age of progress, refinement, and luxury.

What is the mission entrusted to the Church of Christ, and therefore in a measure to each Christian? It is the loftiest, and at the same time the most arduous, that it is possible to conceive. There is the world shrouded in darkness; that darkness is to be dispelled. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven." There is a black mass of corrupt and corrupting thoughts and habits and principles and passions. That mass is to be kept from putrefaction. "Ye are the salt of the earth." There is society, with all its interests and customs, and pleasures and fashions, united in opposition to a heavenly call, and armed with the strongest prejudice against the gospel of Jesus Christ; that body is to be penetrated, and influenced, and preserved by the leaven of Christ's kingdom, the teaching, the lives of Christ's disciples. Such is the glorious mission, such the noble opportunities, given to the soldiers and servants of the Lord Jesus Christ.

How has the mission been fulfilled? How has the opportunity been employed? Is it possible, is it well for us to persuade ourselves, to persuade each other, that Christian men and women here in England have lived out as they should the principles they profess? Have they advanced as light-bearers into the world, or has the world rather exerted its baneful influence upon them? Why has it become a common excuse with

many who neglect public worship, I am not so bad, so dishonest, so uncharitable, so ill-tempered, as some who attend? Why does not the pulpit exert a mightier influence upon society, upon the masses of the people, upon the world? Is not one reason because the religion of Christ is discredited by the lives of many professing Christians? Are these the people who profess to believe that there is a hell to be shunned and a heaven to live for? Are these the disciples, the followers of Jesus of Nazareth? Are these the uncompromising enemies of falsehood and wrong, the conquerors of the world? Are these indeed to be reckoned amongst those of whom Christ said, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world"?

We do not live in an age of persecution, when physical force is employed to combat spiritual truth and to crush spiritual men, when those who are Christians indeed "count not their lives dear unto them so that they may finish their course with joy." But we do live in an age when the world is employing all its mighty power and seductive influence to transform the Church and ensnare the Christian. Preach, it seems to say, what you will; enlist the beautiful and artistic in your worship as you choose; crowd your churches with earnest and devout worshippers, multiply your agents and your agencies, but at the same time conform in some measure to the opinions and lusts and habits of the worldly. Yield, that you may win. Make allowances. Avoid singularity. Condemn not pleasures which we cannot give up, and theories which we cannot abandon.

Around the Church of Christ, around its ministers, around each Christian, the world has gathered its forces, and all the intellect and fashion and luxury of the age are employed to blunt the keenness of the Christian's weapons, and weaken the effect of the Christian's life. I believe it is impossible to exaggerate the skill and power, the irresistible allurements which are thus arrayed against the cause and the Church of Christ. It is as true, I had almost said more true, now as eighteen centuries ago, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

There are, I know, many well satisfied with themselves, and of whom others think well too, who will lift their hands in amazement at such statements. They know nothing of this fearful strife. They can discover no foe, and they are sensible of no opposition. But what then does this show? That they are already under the influence they despise, and ensnared by the foe they cannot see. The battle begun by Jesus is raging still, and we are either in the thick of the fight, or basely deserting our colours and going over to the enemy. What is the prayer we are taught by our Church to offer? "Graciously hear us, that those evils which the craft and subtilty of the devil or man worketh against us be brought to nought."

Again, we pray, in special reference to our great and terrible enemies, that, as soldiers of Jesus, we may have "put upon us the armour of light!" The more, then, we take the place assigned to us, and use the weapons provided for us, we shall find that there is work to be done, enemies to be encountered, and a warfare to be accomplished.

But then who is sufficient for these things? Who can face and beat

back such foes? Who can hope to encounter successfully all these influences, and to pass unscathed through all these temptations? The armed Christian. Have I been speaking of mighty powers? What a power, what an influence is here!—

> "Soldiers of Christ, arise,
> And put your armour on;
> Strong in the strength which God supplies
> Through His eternal Son!"

We are in the world. It is the scene of our toil. It should be, too, the scene of the Christian's triumph. Knowing what he must meet with, and knowing also his own weakness, the Christian may sometimes wish to avoid the peril, and to retire within himself to the sanctuary of his own home. But that would not be to follow Christ. That would not be the way to become like Christ. He was unworldly, but He went into the world. He was opposed to the pride and hypocrisy and sensuality which He encountered in society, but He did not keep aloof from it. What, then, was the principle upon which He acted, and which should be our guide too. He was in the world, but the world could not claim Him as its own. He went into society, but He was there as one who was entirely separate from all the sin which it nourished and all the evil influence it diffused. He walked through the world admiring its beauty. He mingled with its inhabitants, seeking to do them good. He sat down to eat with publicans and sinners, but separate from all which they loved and admired and indulged.

Thus, then, should it be with us. Many enter into society without an object; many go simply for recreation and pleasure. Can we wonder that they exert no influence? Can they fail to return to their homes and their duties with a loss of spiritual power, leaving behind them, not a testimony, but a stumbling-block. It is often very difficult for the Christian to know where he ought to go, and what he ought to do. Society, it is said, has claims upon him. True, but then there is one who has greater. Christ died for him; he must live for Christ: he is not his own; he is not society's; he is Christ's. His first question, therefore, must be, Will this tend to the honour of my Master and Lord? Shall I be in any measure giving my sanction to what is frivolous and wrong, or shall I be able to bear my witness for Christ? To go, as some do, to places where there is intense worldliness, if not absolutely encouraged evil, is to neglect and abandon altogether the grand and awful mission entrusted to us. Who is the Christian to live for, not only on certain occasions or in certain places, but everywhere and at all times? Is it not for Christ? To go, then, where he cannot name his Lord; to mingle as one who is dumb amongst those who scorn Him; to witness sights, to hear sounds that would have grieved that blessed One, without even the hope of doing good or overcoming evil, is to deny, betray, and dishonour his Lord.

But even when this is not done, are there not those who float along the stream in society without any definite object, any high and holy aim; who bring into it no Christian influence, who leave behind no heavenly example? "Thou hast a few names," was the solemn message sent to Sardis, "which have not defiled their garments." How many are there amongst us who have kept themselves, or even tried to "keep themselves,

unspotted from the world," who regulate all their intercourse in society by the example left us by Christ Himself? Standards are continually set up by individuals, or churches, or society, and men are willing to adopt them if only they can quiet conscience, and comfort themselves with the concurrence of others. Thus was it early in the Christian Church till apostolic reproof and discipline prevailed. Thus was it in the Asiatic churches, till their candlestick was removed, and the ruins of their temples alone remained. Thus, too, will it be with us if there is not more spiritual life, more earnest and believing prayer, more self-denial, more holy living, more brotherly union and concord, more fearless witnessing for God.

To go into society with a right aim is to be prepared to meet much that is trying, and to do much that Christ will one day own. "By the blood of the Lamb," by the help of the Holy Spirit, the heart has here already separated from what is low and base and unholy, and no contact with outward things or worldly men will influence one who is so sanctified and armed. There will be no compromise of principle, no fear of man, no weak compliance, no hesitation to confess Christ. For what purpose, he may well say, am I here, but to show my love, and to honour the name of One who loved me and gave Himself for me? "We bless Thee" should be the language, not only of our lips in church, but of our life in society. "We beseech thee," should be a remembered prayer wherever we go, "give us that due sense of all Thy mercies, that our hearts may be unfeignedly thankful, and that we may show forth Thy praise, by giving up ourselves to thy service, and by walking before Thee in holiness and righteousness all our days." Oh, it is easy to say this, it is another thing to live it. But surely this should be our solemn, prayerful resolve, renewed again and again whenever we go to mingle with our fellow-men, and to influence, for good or evil, the souls for whom Christ died.

I can imagine nothing more sad than the entrance into mixed society of an aimless, half-vanquished Christian, with his loins ungirded and his light extinguished. On the other hand, the presence of one who lives by faith and walks in the Spirit is sure to exercise a mighty influence. A spiritual atmosphere surrounds him, and before he opens his mouth, even men will take knowledge of him that he has been with Jesus, and that he lives for Him. "Like a fair taper," writes Jeremy Taylor of the Countess of Carbery, "when she shined to all the room, yet roundabout her own station she cast a shadow and a cloud, and she shined to everybody but herself. But the perfectness of her prudence and excellent parts could not be hid, and all her humility and arts of concealment made the virtues more amiable and illustrious. For as pride sullies the beauty of the fairest virtues, so humility is the greatest eminency and art of publication in the whole world; and she, in all her arts of secrecy and hiding her worthy things, was but like one that hideth the wind and covers the ointment of her right hand."

There is no place where the Christian needs to be so watchful as in society. The eyes of many rest upon him, to discover the smallest inconsistency, and to mark the least stumble. An angry look, an impatient tone, an unkind word, a timid Christ-dishonouring silence, will undo the effect of earnest pleading and eloquent speech. It will soon be known

with what object he goes into society,—whether it is a worldly or a spiritual one. If it be the former, then it will be said, He is one of us. Come, let us draw him further away from his Bible and his God. If it be the latter, then there are those who will deliberately tempt him to deny his Lord, and there are others who will resent the introduction of unworldly thoughts and the presence of an unworldly man.

But if the aim is right—if conformity to Christ's image has been the daily prayer—if the Holy Spirit's aid has been sought in all the difficulties and trials of life, then we shall see a marvellous influence brought to bear upon the society in which he moves. He is not alone, for the promise is his, "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." More mightily present with him by the Spirit in the deepest recesses of his soul than tongue can tell, more helpfully with him than if he saw his Saviour by his side, and heard His voice. Brethren and friends, remember, the more holy we become, the fuller, the brighter will be our testimony. Not only for our own happiness, but for the sake of Jesus, for the sake of the souls of our companions and friends, "let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord." These are, indeed, motives for holy living and faithful witnessing. What think you of Christ's words, "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father which is in heaven." What animating, yet awful and soul-searching, words are these! Oh, that these truths were more fully, more constantly realised! We need them to enable us to cast off all fear of man, and to make us bold, and faithful, and consistent Christians. We need them to strengthen us for such service as angels might long for, and saints in bliss desire again to perform. We need them, that we may be to society as messengers from the King of kings, and that we may show that we are not ashamed of Christ and His gospel.

Ashamed of Jesus? can it be,
A mortal man ashamed of Thee?
Scorned be the thought by rich and poor,
Oh, may I scorn it more and more.

. . . . . .

Ashamed of Jesus? Yes I may,
When I've no sins to wash away,
No tears to wipe, no joys to crave,
And no immortal soul to save.

Till then—nor is the boasting vain—
Till then I'll boast a Saviour slain;
And oh, may this my portion be,
That Saviour not ashamed of me.

PERSONAL HOLINESS AS INFLUENCING CONDUCT IN TRADE.

The Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton, M.A., Hon. Canon of Worcester, Rector of Hagley, Worcester.

My proper function, if I am not mistaken, as the clerical speaker on such a subject, who is to be followed by a layman so infinitely better acquainted than I can pretend to be with the practical details of the life of business in our day in England, is to state the Christian principles according to which such a life should be conducted. And in defining the precise meaning of the subject assigned to me—"Personal Holiness as Influencing Conduct in Trade," I shall, I think, be safe in saying that personal holiness consists in Christ-likeness—the spirit and mind of Christ animating and guiding a man in all his conduct; and if I must presume to select out of the great sum of the divine graces wherein consists the holiness of Christ, any that may be called specially characteristic, and that have any direct bearing upon the virtues that ought to govern the life of trade, I would say that there are two most prominent: (1) the spirit of perfect sonship towards God, which includes absolute conformity to His will, as expressed in the moral law; and (2) the spirit of perfect, invincible love and brotherhood towards all mankind of every class and order equally—the poor and the weak quite as much as the rich and great. With such a definition well agrees the saying of one of our greatest authorities on any matter concerning the spiritual life:—Archbishop Leighton, adopting an ancient classical expression defining friendship as between man and man, and applying it to friendship—if I may venture the phrase—with God Himself, or true conversion to God, says that it must be shown by "idem velle atque idem nolle," the loving and hating the same things as God does. Such a state of mind, I may add, would necessarily have this effect: it would assimilate a man's wishes to those expressed in what has been called "the divine rule of a Christian's wishes"—the Lord's prayer. For such a man would in all life wish just for those things which are there expressed; and his wishes would rise to his lips just in the order and proportion of the petitions of that divine form of words.

I must endeavour, then, to show in what way holiness, in this sense, would manifest itself in the life of commerce and business as it is in this age and country of the world.

And first let me affirm, for it is by no means needless to do so, that the life of commerce, that is, one which deliberately takes up the work of money-making and money-distributing as the principal occupation of life on earth, would not be necessarily inconsistent with the holiness even of a perfect Christian; that if such a life becomes in any way sinful it must be from the abuse not the proper use of its opportunities.

There is a view of Christian godliness very persistently and sometimes very forcibly put forward in popular works in our days—as notably in "Joshua Davidson" and in "Modern Christianity a

Civilised Heathenism," both of them works which have obtained a large circulation—which would deny this proposition, and affirm that something like communism and voluntary poverty are alone consistent with the precepts of our Lord. But I must maintain that any such view is really founded not in true Christian, but in a distinctly erroneous and Manichean theology. The question turns upon this: Did Christ our Lord come into the world to counterwork or to work in harmony with the original and, as we may call it, natural order of the world? to manifest the possible and intended glory and perfection of this world and its whole order as it was in the beginning, and as it is now, except so far as the sin of men has perverted its life, or to introduce another and different order? Without the smallest hesitation we affirm that He came to re-establish the original order of the world, to vindicate its perfect holiness and moral perfection. That order was the work and the expression of the will of His Father, with whom He was and is from eternity One; and indeed by Him Himself, as well as by the eternal Father, "*all things were made*," and "*without Him was not anything made that was made.*" Therefore we may, and ought to try to read His mind and will concerning us in the whole order of the world—so far as it is still what it was in the beginning—as well as in His written words. Christ our Lord did not come into this world and take His stand amongst us, facing all its wondrously various and manifold life, as a stranger and foreigner, if I may venture the expression, to bring into it a system of living belonging to some other and differently planned world of God's making; but it was a world of His own planning, and therefore, in its fundamental nature, perfect, glorious, fitted, as no other world could be, for bringing up human beings as children of God. He came, therefore, and His Church must by His help be ever doing the same, not to stop, but only to direct aright the whole of its life. "*I am come*," He said, "*that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.*" He came to *re*-form not to *new*-form this divinely-made world; and surely we may, without presumption, say that one of the chief sorrows of the divine Man of Sorrows, while facing the awful sight of the world as it is, was in seeing how noble and divine a thing was here spoilt. He remembered—if I may use the expression—He bore ever in His divine consciousness what it was intended to be in the divine purpose, and in His own purpose; and it must have been infinite pain to see what man, by the use of his free will, had made of it.

How then does this principle apply to that large section and division of human life of which I have to speak—the acquisition, possession, and distribution of earthly riches with which the life of commerce is occupied?

Such a view of Christian morality as I have spoken of—the communistic view—of course founds itself upon the fact that our Lord was pleased to live Himself in great poverty; and that in the Sermon on the Mount, addressed to His first disciples as His missionaries to mankind, appointed to break through and in a great degree to reverse and turn back upon their course the current religious and moral traditions of that day, He used the strongest language to teach that every man who would call himself a disciple of His, must absolutely give up the *service* of the world and of the things in it. But that did not surely mean that he must give up all

use of them for God and in God. He comes into "the palace of the strong man armed"—to use His own awful expression—as a "stronger than he," and takes from him all his goods wherein he trusts. But He does not therefore destroy those goods, but "divides them"—redistributes them to their rightful owners, to be used by His servants for Him. So may I say, that while the Lord takes this world sternly and altogether away from His disciples as their master, He restores it as completely to them as their servant, or rather as the servant of Him whose stewards they are. He takes it away from our selfishness and self-will, but He gives it back to our love and obedience. He denies it absolutely to the "old man" in us, with his carnal lusts and self-will, but He allows it as fully to the use and service of "the new man," the Christ in us. He did not command all His disciples to live the life of missionaries; some who wished to do so He forbade, and sent them back to their homes to live there the life of ordinary men. He had rich disciples whom He did not command to become poor. Penitent Zaccheus was left with a blessing in his great house as a "chief among the publicans" at Jericho, still retaining the half of his goods, after he had quite voluntarily given the other half to the poor. Joseph of Arimathæa was a rich man, and apparently allowed to remain so. Lazarus, Martha, and Mary still lived in the home which He had blessed and glorified by His gracious presence with them in Bethany. "Mary, the mother of Mark," retained her house in Jerusalem, which was large enough to hold large meetings of the disciples. So must the rich men whom, later on in the history of the Church, St Paul commanded not to give up their riches altogether, but to make good and liberal use of those which they seemed called by the Divine Providence to hold. Our Lord Himself said, "Give alms of such things as ye have, and behold, all things are clean unto you." At some times, and under some circumstances—as particularly, we may think, when Christians are going out as missionaries to convert the world—the Divine command is, "Turn the other cheek," and go "without purse or scrip;" but at another the Lord sanctioned the possession of sword as well as scrip. Such commands then are relative to providential circumstances and to the varying conditions of life on earth; the right and wrong respecting such matters can only be taught us by the Divine Spirit, under the promise "Blessed are the pure in heart"—the single-minded servants of God,—"for they shall see God" and know His will in each case. And with reference to riches, St Jerome, as quoted by Bishop Wordsworth upon the Sermon on the Mount, said, "Christ did not say, he who *has* riches is condemned, but he who *serves* riches. The *servant* of riches *keeps* them as a servant, he who has cast off the yoke of servitude *distributes* them as their master." And what else is this but almost a definition of the whole business of commerce?—it is the holding of riches as the gift, and by the appointment, of God in Providence, and the distribution of them in His name, by a man who believes that to be his proper function in the present order of the world. It was, be it observed, *before* the fall, not after it, that the divine commission was given to man to "replenish the earth and subdue it;" and it was before sin came in to mar God's perfect order, that in this wondrous globe of the earth the wonderful variety of products with which the divine creative imagination, if I may so express myself, had stored it, were so distributed in various climes and countries that exchanges must have

been made by men between those of one country and those of another, for the well being, if not for the actual necessities of each. So then, commerce is of divine appointment for man, and *may* be made perfectly holy; it would have existed, we cannot doubt, in this world unfallen; it would have afforded exercise in such a world, under the full blessing of the heavenly Father, to some of the best and noblest faculties of unfallen man—as, for instance, to truth, industry, benevolence, liberality, the worship of God. But is it so that commerce has in fact been conducted by us as a nation, or as individuals? Would to God we could say so altogether! God forbid that we should deny that there have been many noble instances of such use of wealth, both in the history of our nation and of individual men amongst us. We do not forget the abolition of slavery at the cost of a great expenditure of money; we need not overlook the propagation of English freedom and English truth and English respect for men as men, of which in some of our mercantile transactions with other nations we have set an example. But how terribly far are we from standing clear before the bar of God upon this matter! Should we not have to parody the Lord's Prayer in a strange way were we to try to express the real tendency of many of our dealings with other nations, conducted very much under the guidance of our commercial leaders? Look at the opium war; look at the eventful history of the growth of our enormous empire and enormous wealth in India and elsewhere; look at our dealings with the weaker and smaller nations of the earth; look at the testimony of our missionaries to the deep moral corruption often introduced by our traders into heathen countries, erecting a well-nigh insuperable barrier to the propagation there of our divine religion—all of which is part of our national commercial history. If, then, large parts of "the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them" have come into our hands, must we not confess that much of it has been gained even by direct acts of worship and service to the spirit of falsehood, fraud, covetousness, and to the love of Mammon, not of Christ.

This, then, indicates one direction in which personal holiness will influence conduct in trade; it will lead a member of England's commercial class to resist with all his might any such covetous use of our power as a nation.

But I must hasten on to say something of the commoner instances of sin in trade at home; especially sins against truth and against the great duty of mercy to the weak; for these surely are, above others, direct sins against the spirit and mind of Christ.

And with reference to all sins of the kind, I—in common, I fear, with all parochial clergymen—have in some respects a sad tale to tell. It happens to us continually to find, in converse with youths who, having been educated by us in Christian principles, and having entered the life of trade in some of its many branches in England, have returned home after some years so spent, that their consciences are uneasy in consequence of practices plainly contrary to the first principles of Christian morals which they have had to connive at, if not actually to join in, on peril of a kind of martyrdom. The fact is, our youths, on leaving our Christian schools, enter another and most effective school, that of business as it is now amongst us; and there are many departments of it in which I am afraid it must be said that religious instruction is under a bann; Christ must not be

named, at least in business hours, for fear some who must be respected should not happen to hold with Him. The morality, such as it is, is carefully made "undenominational;" it must have no definite outline, or only one wide enough to comprehend besides Christian practices and maxims, many of a widely different sort. This is a state of things against which manifestly every Christian engaged in trade is bound to carry on persistent, and keenly watchful, war.

"The sense of responsibility," it has been well said by one of our noblest Christian teachers, who will not be suspected by any one of an ungenerous view of the conduct of any human being, Frederick Denison Maurice (in *Learning and Working*), "which led Greeks of old to be as diligent in working out the parts of the statue which would be hidden by the wall of the temple as that part which would be exposed to the eye, because the gods would look upon both, seems to have departed from Christendom, which should cherish it most. The flimsy texture which cannot instantly be discovered, the carelessness which will only cause some boiler to explode in a distant ocean where no one will hear who has perished, is considered no outrage upon the modern morality to which we are training our workmen, because we have first imbibed it ourselves." This charge may, we all know, be substantiated against us in a great number of instances. There are a thousand ingenious methods still in use among the transactions of modern commerce, as in those of the old world, for "*making the ephah small and the shekel great*,"—the measure with which we sell as small, and at the same time that with which we receive as large as possible, and of "*selling refuse for wheat and falsifying the balances by deceit*." These are sins against the Eternal Majesty of truth and honour, and also against that love and generosity which makes a man love his neighbour as himself, and wish always to supply him with the best goods, not the worst which he can provide. Against all such "covetous practices" every Christian in commerce is bound to do battle to the death. If in so doing he has to suffer loss, he must remember that, as has been well said, "the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of martyrdom." But surely all classes of men ought to labour to make it less of a martyrdom for any man to do right, and only right, in all trade, and to support by moral influence all noble protesters against dishonesty. Above all, the light of heaven should be let in with all possible fulness upon all hiding-places of deceit and fraud; if it were so, surely these birds of darkness would take flight. But even individual Christians might do much more in this matter than faint hearts suppose. Is not this a case to which the ancient words apply, "Woe unto him that is faint-hearted, *for he believeth not?*" It was said of one of the noblest servants of God granted to us of late, Edward Irving, that "he went about the world making men noble, by believing they were so." If we had more faith in God, and in man, in God and through God—if we believed more firmly in the power of the divine witness to truth and righteousness that speaks in every human heart, and in "the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world," we should have more courage to speak out on the side of God, in all companies, and should find an amount of sympathy that would surprise many. By such speaking out, many practices now common, that are deeply injurious to conscience, such as calling things by names which are, and are known in the trade to be, false, might be abolished. Words, names, which came pure from heaven, but have

become tainted by being handed about in this impure world, might be once more cleansed. The fine gold that has become dim, the silver that has become dross, the wine that has become mixed with water, might be once more made pure. Excuses are pleaded for such practices—as by saying that such fraudulent language is generally understood in trade, and deceives no one. But the excuse is vain; the defence of one generation at the cost of others in the past, is unavailing; these frauds of old time capitalised in such deceptive language, bear interest in a lowered standard of honour from generation to generation; they blunt the edge of conscience, till at last the goods of "the strong man armed" are even "at peace," sheltered from the strokes of God's arrows under the shields of worldly maxims which become accepted as recognised principles by those who ought to know better. There is a striking German saying, "*Ein weit gewissen und gar keins, ist das nicht am ende eins?*"—an easy conscience, and no conscience at all, is there any real difference between the two? Our customs of trade "educate" conscience with terrible effect into "easiness."

As bearing, in one sense, upon the virtue of truth, I must say something of gambling as the act of trusting in chance or luck in the making of money. It is a worship of Chance, the "anarch old," instead of the God of truth and reality, and will be punished accordingly. Upon this point, also, I find some striking words of Mr Maurice. "The truth," he says, "must be spoken. We are becoming a nation of gamblers. Life is beginning to be regarded as a shuffling of cards, as a throwing of dice. We do not ask what we are to do, but what is likely to turn up if we make such and such a cast. Handicrafts, trades, professions, are to be undertaken upon a calculation of chances, not for the sake of a vocation. How can we think quietly, how can we pursue science which only converses with that which *is*, while our whole minds are busy with possibilities and contingencies?" Again, speaking of competition, he says, "We see society dragged along by that mighty power of competition which wise men commend and declare to be the sovereign principle in the universe. They desire to be before others, but the desire is not making them painstaking, thrifty pursuers of fortune. They covet to be rich, and become gamblers. They will take what seems to them the shortest road to riches, heedless, of course, of all warnings that it is a road full of pits in which thousands are lost, while one gets his reward, and finds it to be a wretched reward. You are not, then, in taking this course, really stirring up that enterprise, that hope, which you say, and say rightly, is so essential to a nation's strength and wellbeing. You are producing men who are restless to-day, will be listless to-morrow, pursuers of phantoms—often ugly phantoms—for a while; indifferent, disappointed, heartless loungers when they have missed the prizes."

All this touches upon a key-subject with reference to the Christian morality of trade, that of the lawfulness of being actuated by the spirit of competition. And if by that we mean the spirit of one who makes the motive and mainspring of his zeal and energy in trade to be the outdoing of others, not the advantage of all, we cannot deny that it is essentially and directly anti-Christian; it is the precise opposite of that which we are taught is "the law of Christ," the wish to "bear one another's burthens"—to benefit others as well as ourselves by our action. It is a

principal key-note of all sound commercial morality that trade is to be conducted always for the benefit of all, that the gain of one shall not be purchased by the loss of another, but by a fair exchange of benefits. Thus is the principle of selfishness and covetousness driven out of trade, and the spirit of generosity, chivalry, public spirit, enthroned in its place. And till something of this spirit is infused into the whole life of commerce, till men learn to make it their object and endeavour to do their work—be it in the smallest shop, or the largest warehouse—as a work of service to God in truth and honour, and of large-hearted benevolence to man, doing it as perfectly as they can, not with the motive of outdoing others (however that result may, as of course it often will, follow) but simply to glorify the Creator of all the products of the earth, by bringing out their utmost perfection, and with the wish to benefit all to whom as traders they minister, the spirit of our fallen nature and of a selfish competition has not been exorcised, nor the divine spirit of Christianity been made to take its place.

In illustration of this benevolence in commerce, allow me to read to you an extract from an able and interesting book :—

"Mercantile morals are indeed not the highest, but they are high, and perhaps mark as high a point as has as yet been attained by any widespread class of men. Untiring industry from youth up ; resolute 'scorn of delights,' when these interfere with 'laborious days ;' faithful, exact performance of every business duty, great or minute ; and a sensibility of mercantile honour, which, in the beautiful words of Burke, feels a stain like a wound—all these belong to the best types of the class, especially as it exists in England. But with these is too apt to combine a hardship towards claims which intervene between those of strict right and those of absolute mercy. The merchant is princely is his charities, and towards the men of his own class, when unfortunate, as in cases of bankruptcy without fault, eminently generous and forbearing ; but while he is in the hot strife of business, his adversaries *are* his adversaries, and not his brother men. The rules of the warfare are, indeed, to be strictly observed, as amongst the old knights ; but within those limits, by every fair weapon, sword, spear, and battle-axe, to cut, pierce, and crush, is the recognised law. When a combatant is down and writhing, the victor may stoop to look into his wounds ; but in this again one is reminded of the constancy with which the spirit of the old repeats itself in the forms of the new. The mailed warriors of the Middle Ages were thoughtful for their own caste, but took little account of the lives or sufferings of the peasantry. Edward the Black Prince, the very flower of ancient knighthood, suffered not only men, but women and children, to be massacred, during the reconquest of Guienne. The modern capitalist can often be generous to one of his own caste in a court of bankruptcy, and yet when he returns to his commercial battle, where inferiors are arrayed against him, he resents it as an impertinence to be asked to bestow a thought on the women and the children. 'Business *is* business,' he loves to say—'Charity is charity.' Yet the maxim is false. God made no such distribution of the duties of life." *

Now how far this is a true report of facts, I am not sufficiently informed

* Money and Morals, a Book for the Times, by John Lalor (John Chapman, 1852), pp. 80, 81.

to judge. But at any rate it suggests the great principle that a true Christian would carry with him, through the whole life and battle of commerce, the spirit of an ever-wakeful love and compassion towards all competitors towards all whom the transactions touch,—a spirit of mercy and generosity as well as justice, which would make the battle, so far as it is a battle, always chivalrous, always considerate to the weak and erring, always generous to antagonists. So only can the life of business be Christian.

With reference to the great subject of the conduct of employers towards their workmen, it is scarcely necessary to say much to the present audience, since, happily, the main principles that should regulate it have become commonplaces of all discussions of the subject in our day. Whatever may make the relation of employers to their workmen less a mere business-relation, whatever binds the two to each other in mutually respectful fellowship, whatever, as it has been said, "turns factories into homes and schools for all who work in them," is a means of baptizing commerce with the spirit of Christ.

In innumerable such ways the life of trade opens a wide field for the exercise of some of the noblest Christian graces, and for the most valuable service of God and of our fellow-men. No part of it *need* be a service of mammon; all of it *may* be a service of divine love. That which in the hands of some is cruel, is in those of a Christian a powerful ministry of mercy; that which in some minds ministers to pride is in others the source of a profounder sense of responsibility. Carried on in the spirit of true Christian holiness, the motto of a business life would be the precise opposite of the maxims of the world, especially of the saying "Business is business, and charity is charity." No "business" is rightly conducted, that is not made, throughout its whole course, a direct exercise of far-sighted benevolence to all men; no "charity" is true charity that does not seek to keep itself in constant, and even as far as may be, conscious action through all business hours, as well as in all the rest, of human life. And the end, which may be the result of the whole, the acquisition of wealth, would be valued by a perfect Christian chiefly for the opportunities of wide beneficence for the glory of God, and the best welfare of mankind which it would open to him. How immense the opportunities of one at the head of that mighty power in the history of the world—the commerce of England in our day! Who can measure the good that may be done by such a man? Think of the great institutions he may found, such as no one else could found, for the good of the world; of the vast power which such a position gives for raising the tone, the motives, the principles of commerce all over this wide and populous earth! Could we but enthrone in all English halls of commerce the graces that by divine right ought to reign in them, could we but cast out the ignoble spirit of falsehood and of selfishness, in all their Protean forms, and substitute the spirit of fearless truth, of far-seeing, self-sacrificing love and generosity, and of true brotherliness to the whole race of man, especially to the sufferers and the oppressed, we should vindicate for trade its true glory as a mighty ministry for God in the earth. Then we should make all men see, in a way and to a degree they have never seen hitherto, the truth of the great words so well inscribed as a motto over the lofty entrance into the great centre of English world-wide commerce, the Royal Exchange in London—"THE EARTH"—the whole earth,

and not any one part of it only—"IS THE LORD'S, AND THE FULNESS THEREOF." Surely personal holiness would make every man in business aim, in all his life, at this great result. "The strong man armed" may be "keeping his palace;" but do not let us leave him his goods in peace. There is a "Stronger than he," who is able and willing evermore to work with us at "taking from him all his armour wherein he trusts, dividing the spoil," and giving it back altogether to the blessed service of its divine and only rightful Owner.

The RIGHT REV. THE PRESIDENT.

I AM not going to praise the next speaker, or even to thank him; but I wish to say that he has set an example which many employers would do well to follow. He has provided for his work-people convenient schools and a chapel. He has taken out a licence from me as a lay deacon, to perform services with my sanction in that chapel.

Mr GEORGE SKEY.

IT seems fitting and appropriate that some one connected with trade should be heard upon this very weighty and serious subject.

This qualification for the duty now devolving upon me I certainly possess, if I possess no other, for I have been actively engaged in trading pursuits for upwards of thirty years.

I hear it contemptuously asked, What has personal holiness to do with trade? Business is one thing, religion is another.

Yea, further; it has been stated again and again, and sometimes upon what would be considered very good authority, that it is impossible for a man to be engaged in business and maintain his honesty.

I am bold enough, in opposition to such views as these, to claim for a life of business that it offers a most suitable platform for the building up of Christian character.

The alternations of hope and fear, the severe trials of temper, the continual chafings of the spirit, the ups and downs, the unexpected reverses, are, if viewed as the discipline of our Heavenly Father, most salutary and beneficial.

Indeed, a man's business is frequently the crucible in which he is placed by God to try his faith—his love—his obedience. Here is the school in which many a priceless soul is trained and disciplined for heaven. Poor foolish creatures as we are, we think our business has missed its proper end if it leads not to wealth, or at the least to competency, forgetting that an all-wise and gracious God makes all the events of time subservient to the highest and eternal good of His children.

I see one, a prominent figure in commercial life; prosperity has, for the most part, marked his career. As years roll on his means increase, his influence extends, and for good and good alone he uses both. Where support is needed for a worthy cause, it finds in him a champion and a

friend; his time, his talents, his experience, his purse, are all available, and freely are they used, wherever God's cause, the necessities of his fellow-men, or the voice of Christian brotherhood, may summon him. No selfish love of ease avails to make him spare his labour; no lavish scale of expenditure contracts his power of giving. But a change comes over his commercial fortunes; a year of loss instead of profit is followed by another and another. Thinking he, perhaps, has been remiss, the good man redoubles his attention—his plans are laid with more than usual thought and care—increased vigilance and circumspection mark all his dealings, his calculations, his management. As yet his losses have only impaired his fortune, not crippled his business, or touched his credit. With meek submission he bends beneath the blow; for is it not a Father's hand that deals it? That same loving God who first gave all, must take back what to Him seems good; and so the man bears almost the same sunny cheerful aspect in his home, his business, as before. But in his retirement there is a change; his self-examination is more close and frequent—his secret prayers are more fervent and importunate—his chastisement has borne some blessed fruit—it has drawn him closer and closer still to his God. But he dies in comparative poverty. Is this a failure in commercial life? Worldly men may call it so; true, it is a present affliction; a light affliction which is but for a moment, and such sanctified affliction works out in God's own way a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.

When earth's shadows flee away for ever, and the true and the false are alike made clearly manifest in the light of eternity, then shall it be seen how the trials and abasement, and at last poverty, were among the all things which worked together for good to this servant who loved his Lord.

Success, indeed — what is success, but bending reverently, submissively, thankfully to the will of God?

But I will ask you to trace with me the steps of two men, representatives of two very different classes of tradesmen.

The one has been taught and has embraced the better way. He views the present life not as the end, but only as the pathway to a higher, happier state of being. He lives with eternity in view; a sinner, and he knows it. He knows, too, the love of God, in sending His beloved Son to be the Saviour of sinners. He has sought and found that Saviour. Has learned the full meaning of that sentence in our creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." Yes, he believes, and his heart is given to God. The inquiry from that heart is now, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" He hears St Paul's words, "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and your spirit, which are God's" (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20).

How shall he glorify God? He has to work that he may live; work, perhaps, under discouraging circumstances. Again the Word of God appeals to him, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. x. 31).

Oh, how that man's labour is ennobled now! What a new light is thrown upon his otherwise toilsome calling! He works, not because he must work for the means of support, for this is the labour of a slave, and God's children are not slaves, but the Lord's free men; but he works

because God has given him the work to do; he labours with a will, for he knows the eye of the Master whom he loves and whom he serves is upon him.

What dignity does this give to any honest calling, and what support too! The man who works thus—for such a Master, and with such motives—will overcome difficulties and surmount obstacles, and by patient continuance, win success, where a mere worldly man, working from a lower standpoint, would faint and be discomfited, for the want of success turns worldliness to gall and wormwood, but it quickens Christian diligence to renewed exertion.

Consecration of the whole man to God—to be His—to work at what, and where He pleases, and to work as unto, and for Him—this is the proper standard for the man of business.

It is the lowering of this standard of personal holiness which causes men to regard labour, and labour in trade more particularly, as an evil necessity.

The meanest work done from this only true motive—love to God, and a desire to glorify Him—is elevated at once into the sphere of a religious obligation. As the quaint George Herbert says—

> "Who sweeps a room as for Thy Law,
> Makes that and the action fine."

And now let us follow the second representative of these two very different classes of traders.

He has never realised that the law of labour is a law of love. Labour to him is a hard, painful necessity. He views with envy his rich neighbour, who can live in luxury and ease, without the necessity for work. He wishes he could be like him; money will do it. He will try to get money; no pains, no effort shall be spared. And so he enters upon the race to get money, that he may surround himself with the comforts and luxuries of wealth. These being his highest motives, what are we to expect?

No reference to God—no seeking for His guidance—no fear of falling under the power of temptation—no distrust of self; the one absorbing idea is to get money; and if, at times, conscience asserts her prerogative, and raises scruples, she is silenced with the plea of necessity, or stifled with the ever ready excuse that the keenness of competition compels this or that departure from the strictly honourable course.

Can we be surprised that, in thus making haste to be rich, he should, step by step, degenerate into the unscrupulous, dishonest tradesman? "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"

Granted that he gains the coveted wealth, what then? Probably an exhibition of worldliness and pride saddening to behold.

In extravagance and gaiety, in costly entertainments and profuse display, the wealth so questionably obtained is lavishly expended. Not unfrequently, indeed, the stream is suddenly dried up, the collapse is even more sudden than the rising; and the proverb, "Wealth gotten by vanity shall be diminished," receives another illustration.

Never in the history of our country have the temptations to what is fitly termed "pride of life" been so great, so almost universal, as at the

present time; perhaps, in some measure, it is the outcome of recent national prosperity.

If there is a prayer in our grand old Liturgy which we as citizens and faithful subjects should at this time offer with intense desire and earnestness, it is this, "In all time of our wealth, good Lord, deliver us."

"There is increasing audacity, increasing greed, increasing fraud, increasing impunity, and these are stimulated and fed by increasing indulgence and ostentation" (*Times*).

Look at the rivalry in equipage—in dress—in splendour of furniture—in the glitter of plate—in plush and livery buttons—in costly banquets and splendid establishments.

The rage to make large fortunes is not confined to the covetous, whose sole desire is to accumulate—it is eagerly shared by those whose thirst for display can only thus be gratified; and as the ordinary safe and steady path in trade is not remunerative enough, they rush into dangerous speculations; for these two, speculation and extravagance, are generally coupled—they are inevitable companions. Speculation, if it turns out profitably, has ever a tendency to lead to extravagance, whilst extravagance resorts to speculation for the means to feed its costly demands. For a time the crash may be evaded—for a few years in the individual—for generations, perhaps, in a nation.

But let us return to our first representative character—to him who lives for God and for eternity. The Lord has made him to prosper—and what is the result? His personal expenditure is increased, his style of living somewhat changed; but the greatest change will be in other and less selfish directions. He acknowledges who it is that gave him power to get wealth—he knows whose is the silver and the gold; and as the hand is opened to the call of duty and of charity, the language of the full heart is the language of David. "For all things come of Thee, and of Thine own have we given Thee" (1 Chron. xxix. 14).

I know no finer spectacle than to see a man rising step after step, by dint of industry, perseverance, and honourable conduct, in the ranks of his fellow-men, and he maintaining the same simplicity and modesty of character and demeanour which marked his earlier days—the beginning of his career. To grow rich in worldly goods, and rich at the same time in faith and good works. To be rising in honour and respect amongst men, and to be living nearer and nearer to God. To be laying up treasure in heaven, whilst earthly wealth is pouring in abundantly.

This is indeed a noble sight; and yet if worldly prosperity is not thus accompanied, surely that which we call success is but a great misfortune, and the wealth so fondly deemed a blessing is only a hindrance and a snare.

I have only time just to glance at the influence of the example of these two men within the limits of their own business circle. The evil example of the one is like a spark upon tinder whenever it comes in contact with those whose hearts are as yet unsanctified, unrenewed. Think of it—the young men, clerks and others, whose business education is acquired in such a school; think of it—the apprentices, the workmen, the entire staff of the busy hive of industry presided over by such a man. This evil example, at some point or other, touches all—comes in contact with all, and like as the dirty stream, charged with the filth of some large town,

leaves its black, foul mark upon the grassy banks it traverses, so does this evil example leave its ugly, dark stain on all it touches. Can we wonder if the want of principle in the employer leads to deceit and fraud in the employed.

As I have meditated from time to time in the way of preparation for this paper, no one thought has come into my mind so vividly, and grown upon me with such increasing weight and intensity, as this—the fearful responsibility of those of us charged, it may be, with the duty of conducting an extensive business, who disregard this question of personal holiness.

The example of the other stands forth in striking contrast. I have likened the operations of the evil example to a spark upon tinder. The influence of personal holiness, in the other, is more like the dew—unobtrusive, silent, pervasive, fructifying. Perhaps there is no more difficult thing in business than to create in the minds of those employed a thorough belief in the rectitude and honour of an employer. Protestations of good intentions will not do it; a code of bye-laws, however good, will not do it; nay, liberality will not do it: but quiet persistence in strictly honourable dealing with them, will, if anything will.

But the effect of personal holiness is seen and felt not only in the example and character of a godly master. Its noiseless, gentle influence, in spite of many disadvantages, is felt, and felt for good, where the godly workman pursues his daily calling in the factory, the mine, the field. My own experience as an employer has taught me the unspeakable comfort, the immense advantage, of having godly persons in your service. I speak with a grateful sense of this benefit. I have at the present time, and I most heartily thank God for it, connected with me, and occupying various positions, from the labourer upwards, some few at least to whom personal holiness is no mere sentiment. Their godly, consistent walk has made, and still is making, its influence for good felt, not only by their fellows, but by many others, and by me their earthly master. I have no fear of their not serving me faithfully. And why? Because they "serve the Lord Christ," they work for a heavenly Master, whom they delight to honour; their work for me has been, and will be, done to the best of their ability, for they do it as unto the Lord.

I am glad to think that I am not alone to-day in this. I speak in a busy centre of industry, and in the hearing of many employers and others connected with trade, and I know they will concur in my statement. If employer and employed alike owned and served in their varied posts of duty the one Master Christ, there would soon be an end of strikes and divisions—the selfish employer, the idle or the drunken workmen, the unprincipled agitator, would be seen no more—one common bond of union, brethren in Christ, would unite them—one motto would serve for both, "Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord."

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, 8th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took the Chair at Half-past Two o'clock.

RELIGIOUS AND DEVOTIONAL BOOKS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. Canon King.

It would be obviously impossible, in the short time necessarily allowed to these papers, to attempt to touch upon, much more to exhaust, all the different aspects of the subjects proposed. Indeed, the wise and comforting plan of appointing several readers and speakers for one subject seems mercifully to suggest that none should be expected to treat the matter exhaustively, but each to treat one or more of those points which seemed to the reader or speaker to be of express value. I must, therefore, intentionally omit many things I might wish to say, and content myself with offering to your consideration one or two remarks which seem to me to be at least of some present importance.

And first it might be well to remind ourselves that all human efforts—even those connected with the highest and most sacred subjects—are liable to transitoriness, imperfection, and possibly error. This is obviously true of the numerous religious societies and of books of hymns, as well as more particularly of books of devotion. They may have their day, and pass out of fashion; they may have their great value for the immediate need, and yet leave something more to be desired. They may have had their mistakes, and yet for all this they may have done their work, and done it well, according to the measure of all human efforts, and deserve at the hands of successive generations, not unqualified censure and rejection, but prayerful consideration and, if possible, grateful and patient amendment.

I must therefore express my thankfulness to Almighty God, and my gratitude to all those who have laboured in this good work, for the bountiful increase of all kinds of religious and devotional books which we have seen in these last years in and from this country. On the whole, I doubt not, the result has been good. They are the fruit, and they contain the seeds, of true spiritual life. I say *in* and *from* this country, for, while we cannot value too highly or ponder too carefully the record of the life and the sermons and the letters of spiritual counsel of the truly simple, truly holy, truly English saint of Hursley, yet still it

would be, I believe, an unjust and therefore an intolerable burden if a timid and suspicious policy should try to prohibit the importation of all books of devotion adopted from foreign lands, instead of trusting God to sustain England's powers to enrich herself by the good things that come to her from without, and give her strength to develop those very spiritual national qualities for which God has so marvellously sustained her in her singular position.

There may be, there are, dangers no doubt connected with this line of thought, but the dangers of an unjust suppression are, I believe, far greater. Members of the English Church are thereby members of the Catholic Church, and whatever is truly Catholic is undoubtedly theirs. This is no new claim for the Church of England. In 1700 Dr Nicholl published an adaptation for the *Introduction to a Devout Life*, and we feel we need the help of the refined and common-sense and saintly Bishop of Geneva now as much as then. When St Francis de Sales is truly Catholic he is and must be ours.

In 1707 Dr Hicks translated for English use a Treatise on the Education of Women, and whatever may have been the rights of the quarrel with Bossuet or Bossuet's nephew, we cannot consent to give up the intelligence and wisdom and grace and holiness of the Archbishop of Cambrai. Fenelon can never be contraband. I need hardly add that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and by John Wesley and by Waterland in the eighteenth century, the *Imitation of Christ* was regarded as most helpful to the spiritual life, and I do not think any unprejudiced person would wish to give up Thomas à Kempis now. I may, in short, conclude this line of thought by a quotation which has been already quoted :— "Notwithstanding the great and deserved aversion which this nation has to Popery, yet the books of their divines upon devotional and practical subjects have met with as favourable reception among us, as if the authors had been of a better religion."—Dr Pusey's *Letter to the Bishop of London*, 1851.

But not only would I express my gratitude for the number of the books, but also for their adaptation to all classes of society, all ages, and, as far as possible, all spiritual states. This is a marked feature of the present day and of the present books of devotion. They have made things plain and practically intelligible to the less educated and to the young. Here, again, no doubt there is danger, and certainly much opportunity is offered for criticism. We must thank the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol for endorsing this principle in his Preface to a Book of Prayers and Meditations for the Holy Communion, when he says—"The writer is young, and for that very reason more likely to touch the religious feelings and sympathies of those for whom the prayers are intended." This is true.

We have needed elasticity, more loving consideration, more unselfish sympathy in reference to the religious life, and the expression of it in different classes of society and by different ages, and in its different degrees. With the highly educated there is much that need not be, that had better not be, plainly and fully expressed. A hint, a phrase quoted, even a word will suggest more than could be written on many pages, but with the less educated and poor, hints and suggestions have

little or no meaning. You must call a spade a spade if you want one; and this is often painful and repugnant to more sensitive minds.

A good deal of the difficulty regarding books of devotion belongs, I believe, to this line of thought. All ages, all classes, all spiritual states cannot equally enjoy the same prayers and use the same hymns and books of devotion; but they ought all to remember to give to others the liberty they each claim for themselves, and not forget that, though different members, they are, in truth, one body.

That we have done right on the whole may be seen, I think, yet more plainly from two further considerations.

1st. From the insufficiency of some useful and good books, which, though not written by members of the Church of England, have yet been popular and influential amongst us. I can take but two examples: the first shall be the well-known book, Baxter's *Saints' Rest.* Mr Wilberforce, in his *Practical View*, expresses the high value set upon this and other devotional writings of the deservedly great, but unfortunately Nonconformist, divine of Kidderminster. Mr Wilberforce says—"It may, perhaps, be truly affirmed, that the writings of few, if any, uninspired men have been the instruments of such great and extensive benefit to mankind as those of Mr Baxter." And the *Saints' Rest* contains, certainly, much which is most valuable. The idea of the book, as a whole, might well be urged on this busy and prosperous country as a check to the refined materialism which in different ways dulls so much of our spiritual life.

His earnest appeal for the necessity of more of this heavenly meditation is most valuable:—"The duty which I press upon thee so earnestly, and in the practice of which I am now to direct thee, is the set and solemn acting of all the powers of thy soul in meditation upon thy everlasting rest. . . . This duty of meditation, or the considering and contemplating of spiritual things, . . . is confessed to be a duty by all, but practically denied by most. Many that make conscience of other duties easily neglect this; they are troubled if they omit a sermon, a fast, or a prayer in public or private; yet were never troubled that they had omitted meditation perhaps all their lifetime to this very day, though it be that duty by which all other duties are improved, and by which the soul digesteth truths for its nourishment and comfort. It was God's command to Joshua, 'This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein' (Josh. i. 8). As digestion turneth food into chyle and blood, for vigorous health; so meditation turns the truths received and remembered into warm affection, firm resolution, and holy conversation. This meditation is upon thy everlasting rest; yet I would not have thee cast off other meditations; but surely as heaven hath the pre-eminence in perfection, it should have it also in our meditation." "This meditation," he further adds, "should be at stated times." "Stated times" he calls the hedge of duty—once at least every day; for himself he thinks the evening and Sundays the best time for heavenly contemplation. Surely, nothing could be better than this, and much more might be added equally valuable on the need of avoiding occasions of sin, the due care of the body, the means of retaining the thought of heaven by the due use of sensible

objects, &c. But, nevertheless, this book alone would not teach a man the full doctrine of Baptism or the Eucharist, or the full scheme of supernatural assistance which God has provided so mercifully in His Church, in order that His banished be not expelled from Him.

And, once more, if we take that which Mr Wilberforce has called that most useful book, *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, by Dr Doddridge, we shall see that it is, indeed, most useful, thoroughly good and practical, and adapted far more than many Churchmen's books to the needs of all classes, and yet that it is deficient. Let us look. All that he says of the need of real conversion and looking to Christ for pardon is admirable :—"You must apply to Christ, with a deep abhorrence of your former sins, and a firm resolution of forsaking them, forming that resolution in the strength of His grace" (p. 84).

The first and most important advice is, look to Christ and apply yourself to Him ; go to the Saviour ; fall down in this speechless confusion at His feet; say to Him, "O Lord, I have foolishly attempted to be mine own saviour ; but it will not do. I am sensible the attempt is vain ; and therefore I give it over, and look unto Thee ; on Thee, O blessed Jesus, Who art sure and stedfast, do I desire to fix my anchor." "To thine atonement, obedience, intercession, O Thou holy and acceptable High Priest, would I trust." All this is excellent ; so again is the advice on edification and the marks of the Christian tempers.

"You must make it your care to show your love by obedience, by forming yourself as much as possible according to the temper and manner of Jesus, in Whom you believe ; you must make it the great point of your ambition, 'to be a living image of Christ.' Look, then, into the life and temper of Christ, as described and illustrated in the Gospels, and search whether you can find anything like it in your own life. Have you anything of His devotion, love, resignation to God ? anything of His humility, meekness, and benevolence to men ?"

Further, we are to consider well the great branches of godliness, and see how we stand towards them : there are our relations to God, our neighbour, ourselves—to God as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, to govern ourselves, souls and bodies, our thoughts and desires, as well as words and actions ; and to test our conduct by certain qualifications, such as sincerity, tenderness, zeal, prudence. But perhaps the most striking chapter of the book is the seventeenth, on self-dedication. It urges a solemn surrender of the soul to God, and provides a form in which it may be made. It is to be done with all possible solemnity, in express words, in many cases in writing. The hand and seal is to be set to it, with the day, and month, and year ; it is to be done with some more than ordinary religious solemnity, on a day of secret fasting and prayer. The form given is long, but a few words will sufficiently indicate the solemnity of the act :—"Blessed God, it is with the utmost solemnity that I make this surrender of myself unto Thee. I avouch and declare myself this day to be one of Thy covenant children and people ; henceforth I am Thine, entirely Thine—I would be wholly Thine, Thine for ever. . . . Not only do I consecrate all that I am and have to Thy service, but I also most humbly resign, and submit to Thine holy sovereign Will, myself, and all that I can call mine. I leave, O Lord, to Thy management and direction

all I possess, and all I wish; . . . contentedly resigning my will unto Thine."

This is very tremendous, and no renewal of baptismal vows or resolutions in retreats could go beyond it. To help us in these resolutions very excellent rules are given in the nineteenth chapter, which is a reprint of a letter written by Dr Doddridge to a young friend in 1727.

The directions are divided into three heads—How we are to regard God in the beginning, the progress, and the close of the day. Under the first head he directs us to lift up our hearts to God as soon as we wake, while we are rising, and then to set ourselves seriously to the secret devotions of the morning; for this he thinks most may obtain half or three-quarters of an hour—an exact method he declines to lay down, but his general scheme includes acts of praise, prayer, reading of the Scriptures, ten or twelve verses, not critically, but with the devotional, practical view, with prayer; then the forecasting, or prospect of the day, considering the duties, temptations, opportunities. Then comes the business of the day, and this is to be entered upon with a sense of God's authority, avoiding a dreaming, sluggish, indolent temper, which nods over its work and does only the business of one hour in two or three. Through the day there is to be watchfulness, ejaculatory prayer even in the midst of work, and government of the thoughts in solitude; in the evening devotion, like the morning, changing the prospect of the day for retrospective self-examination. It is impossible, one would say, for any one seriously to follow such advice as this without deriving great benefit and feeling great gratitude and attachment to the book which gave it. And yet that book is insufficient, good and thorough as it is, for conversion, dedication, and discipline of the affections and will to God; yet there is scant or no mention of the great Christian ordinances of baptism, confirmation, absolution, Communion, and the whole heritage of the faith committed to the saints. The book, helpful as it is, leaves a want. Not only is there this insufficiency in these truly valuable books of the Nonconformists, but also a practical obscurity and want of adaptation to the less educated and poor in the still more valuable books of our great divines. I can but briefly illustrate this. Few books, perhaps, were more read in the first half of the present century than Wilberforce's *Practical View*, and well worth re-reading it is still; but I would observe its limited adaptation; it is of professed Christianity in the higher and middle classes. The poor are not directly addressed at all, and though no one would suspect a Wilberforce of want of sympathy, yet the phrases "lower orders" and "inferior classes" show that the book did not pretend to be a poor man's book—that something more was still needed.

If we take the still more famous work of Jeremy Taylor, the *Golden Grove*—in the threefold division of this little treatise—Credenda, Agenda, Postulanda—an instructed soul might indeed find all that he would desire. The diary or rule for the day, beginning with the seven actions of piety—an act of adoration, of thanksgiving, of oblation, of confession, of petition, of intercession, of meditation—or serious, deliberate, useful reading of the Holy Scriptures—is full of practical holiness and wisdom.

The outcast and despairing would find, indeed, here that Jesus has appointed ministers not only to preach but to "comfort" and "restore and reconcile us." He would find here that the Holy Ghost consecrates

Bishops and absolves the penitent; he would be advised, "Be sure that in all things a spiritual guide take you by the hand." This is enough for us now, but sin is a blinding, hardening, intimidating thing, and practically have the readers of the *Golden Grove* thoroughly thought out for themselves and for others, who perhaps cannot read, what these passages may involve? The same is true of that valuable book of the more retired, but none the less truly holy Sherlock. Richard Sherlock's *Self-Examination and Holy Communion* is a rich heritage of Scriptural and Catholic teaching, binding us together with the prayers of St Ambrose, St Augustine, St Thomas Aquinas, Thomas à Kempis, the old liturgies of East and West. Would that we could reach to the height of his devotion.

Let me, in conclusion, add a few words by way of suggestion as to our present need. While I am on the whole grateful for the number of modern books, both English and adapted from foreign sources, I think the time has come when it would be most beneficial if all who are able would turn their attention to the earlier English books, and see if there are not treasures for the spiritual life which have been of late too much neglected. In explicitness on certain points, in general arrangement and adaptation to the less learned or the young, I have said they have left something to be supplied, but there is a danger lest the very effort at clearness of arrangement, plainness of statement, adaptation to the capacity and fervour of the young, should deprive us of those still more important marks which have been pointed out as characteristics of our earlier English books—"their grave simplicity, wholesome sobriety, soundness of teaching, and richness of Scriptural instruction and exhortation." I can but refer to the names of a few writers. The thoroughly Scriptural *Devotions* of Bishop Andrewes; the profound and practical knowledge of human nature shown in the writings of Jeremy Taylor and in the moral maxims of Bishop Wilson; the sober discipline suggested in the *Fasts and Festivals* of Robert Nelson; the *Devotions* of Hele, which we have lately been allowed to know were seldom out of the hands and never off the library table of the munificent donor of Keble Chapel, and enabled him by God's grace to bear the burden of that princely fortune, and yet remain in the primitive and apostolic sense poor in spirit—these books have done much for England and might we believe do more—might add to the present explicitness and fervour a strength which would deal yet more thoroughly with the more manly natures among our men, and dwelling mainly on the fundamental truths help us to a firmer hold on God.

If something of this sort could be done we should, I think, be drawn more together as well as nearer to God. The old people with their older-fashioned books would feel less estranged, and the younger would be made stronger and more ready to sympathise with the aged.

The Rev. G. E. Jelf, M.A., Vicar of Saffron Walden, Essex.

Let me try to give you (1st), some principles as to private devotion; (2d), some facts about modern devotional books; (3d), some suggestions as to their use: and then let me take my proper place in this assembly as a learner, rather than a teacher, though humbly wishing to do some work for the brethren, as a priest in the Church of God.

I. It is not intended to probe too curiously the expressions, still less the inward desires, of the spirit when it prays. Known only to God are the secret struggles, the intense energies, the unutterable groanings, the passionate cravings, the faintness still pursuing, the faith not to be subdued by any fears or any doubtings, the undaunted perseverance, of the soul which wrestles with Him in personal worship.

And our minds are so differently made, our experiences so thoroughly various, our several training so peculiar to itself, our very use of language so dependent on the circumstances of our home, our friends, our calling, and our life, that it would be impossible for any one writer, in the brief space of a Congress paper, even to glance at the minute details which yet are very real to all earnest Christians, and which we do keep secret among ourselves, every man in the depth of his heart.

Suffice it now to point out certain general rules which should guide and influence us, more or less, positively and negatively, whenever, with or without our manuals, we approach, for and by ourselves, the Throne of the heavenly grace. In this I am sure you will go along with me, for it concerns not matters of individualism in religion (which may or may not be important), but rather what Montgomery speaks of as "the spirit's vital breath."

This spiritual devotion, then, this sighing of the soul for God, this inward aspiration which has some cry or other for its language, must, in order to be thoroughly and distinctively Christian, be marked by such characteristics as these:

(1), It must breathe the very atmosphere of Holy Scripture. For in this we have, brought down to us for our use on earth, the speech of heaven. God's Word, though originally uttered to us as a revelation, becomes in turn, very remarkably, the channel of communication between us and God, the unveiling and unsealing of those profound thoughts within, which are, in truth, created by Him who is at once Lord of the height above and of the deep below, and who can only be duly sought and praised in the Voice which He has Himself inspired. If there must always be a human element in our petitions, there must also be something divine therein. If the woof of this daily and hourly work must spring from "the soul's sincere desire," its warp should be that which connects together, apart from all subjective feelings of ours, the teaching Heart of God and the listening heart of man. Otherwise, since God is in heaven and we upon earth, how few must our words be, how soon, if we did speak much of our own unaided wisdom, would our mouth cause our flesh to sin (Eccles. v. 1–6), and the potter's vessel, losing its golden treasure, be marred in the hands of the potter!

(2), Next, it must be very real. Even in that serene air which is

meant to buoy us up, even while we are employing the pathetic and marvellously-expressive and miraculously-suitable verses of the Psalmist, even when we are borrowing the heavenward wings of our Lord's own instructions or supplications, we must keep, not morbidly but conscientiously, a check upon our utterances to God. We must not, I say, be morbidly scrupulous about this; for were we so, we could scarcely dare to pray at all, certainly not in the breathings of the saints, still less in the echoes of God's own glorious voice. But we must at least ask Him to set a watch before our mouth, so that the angel who records our worship may be able to say, "Behold, he prayeth."

(3), Further, it must speak as with the lips of a human nature which has been redeemed—with the reverent humility and holy boldness of one who has free access to the Father of mercies, and who, while kneeling in Gethsemane, stands up because of the Cross close by, and beholds with open face, in the vision of the Crucified, "the glory of the Lord."

(4), And so, of course, it must always have, explicitly or implicitly, reference to the atoning death, and justifying resurrection, and prevailing intercession of that Holy One, our righteous Advocate on high, our continually-abiding Priest in heaven as on earth. The Lord's Prayer, remember, was taught to the disciples before He suffered: and though they undoubtedly used it for three years, it was not as yet offered up through Him. The three years came to an end—and the same night in which He was betrayed, a change passed over that and every prayer—a change, not, indeed, fully realised till Good Friday and Easter Day noted together the great event of the world, but clearly established by the Lord Himself, when He said on the eve of His crucifixion, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My Name, He will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My Name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full" (St John xvi. 23, 24). Cannot we see at once how expedient it becomes for us now, as Christians, to offer up the lesser Litany before the "Oratio Dominica" (Lord, have mercy upon us: Christ, have mercy upon us: Lord, have mercy upon us. Our Father . . .)—how essential to the validity of our prayers, to plead by the bedside, as before the altar, the great Name, the one Life, the precious Blood, which has redeemed us to God? Surely it is only through "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" that we can attain, even on our knees, and in our truest repentance, to "the love of God" and "the fellowship of the Holy Ghost."

(5.) And this reminds us, further, that this Holy Ghost must be honoured in our devotions. As "we know not what we should pray for as we ought," and as we rely, amid our many infirmities, on the help of that eternal Spirit which "maketh intercession in us . . . according to the will of God," so should there never be a morning or an evening, no, nor yet a single noontide, of any one of our brief days, without the sanctifying, uplifting, guiding Presence of the Comforter, sought first, then acknowledged with awe, then thankfully acted upon, for the furtherance of our prayers. My brethren and sisters in the Church, are you using, even once in the day, the "Veni, Creator Spiritus"? If not, can you wonder at your coldness, your wanderings, your unbelief? Begin on that way immediately (though it be but a servant that invites you), and you shall have instead faith, fixedness, fire of love.

(6.) And so once more it will be no mere form, but a great assistance

to you as you bow your knees and shield your forehead with the sign, to say humbly and devoutly, "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." For this will help to keep you from vagueness, from fancy, from passing enthusiasm, in your prayers. They will embody or embalm the faith, and as in your own wonderful Prayer-Book, so, in increasing degree, in your private devotions, the "lex orandi" will be the "lex credendi"—your prayers, and not your feelings, will be the measure of your belief.

(7.) There is yet one point which may have suggested itself to many who for weeks and months have been "with one mind" and (may we not add) "with one mouth" beseeching God to bless us in this Congress of ours. Each day's petitions must have a practical bearing on the actions of our life. The arrow which is aimed at heaven must come from a heart that is fully bent on the *service* of God. "The fruit of good works" must ever be the object of our so often sowing in agony and tears.

II. And now let us see how far the religious publications of the day meet the requirements thus briefly glanced at. It is satisfactory to be able to speak on this, if not from a very full mind, at least from something more than mere guesswork; for the great kindness of the leading publishers [which I venture thus openly to acknowledge] has supplied me with a large number of these books; and having examined many of them, I am in a position (not, indeed, to judge for you, for I am no judge, only a witness, but) to state certain particulars which may be helpful to members of the Church, by way of encouragement in these somewhat anxious times.

Generally, then, it may be said, after a more or less careful survey of such devotional forms (which seem to be issuing in streams from the press), that they very strikingly illustrate (1) the present, abiding, unshaken faith of Christians, holding to prayer, whatever else seems either taken away or clouded over—prayer, as that which proves the Godward kindling of the burning heart—prayer, as the essential outcoming of the unbroken trust in Christ; (2) the vast volume of prayer in which that faith bursts upward to God—from men and women of widely differing gifts and attainments and education and bias, yet all according to their power, lifting the soul; and (3), the oneness of those who, in that confluence of devotion, name the Name—literally a "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," since peace, if ever, is realised when we are on our knees before the one great God and Father of us all, speaking to Him through the human ear and heart of His own divine incarnate Son, in words "which the Holy Ghost teacheth." And this brings us to a closer comparison of those principles which were pointed out to you, and these manuals which are before us, many of them consecrated to us by their blessed aid through years of need, or care, or grief. Out of that greater knowledge of yours, my friends, test what shall now be said; and if it fail in truth, help me and others by better information and wiser counsels.

Is it not, then, a fact drawn from the study of these particular works, that they do take us to the very fountain-head of Holy Writ? Glance at this packet in my collection, from all sorts of publishers. All of them are more or less grounded on, and derive their worth, in many cases their wealth, from that rich treasure, the Sacred Word. Then, too, they are, as a

rule, true outpourings of the heart—humble yet confident appeals of the regenerate—resting, one and all, on the merits of Christ, and on no other mediator, even if occasional and sometimes unsafe mention is made of the intercession of the saints—turning instinctively to the Holy Spirit for efficacy—constantly loyal, I do not say only to the Catholic faith, but to the Catholic faith as held by the English Church—and, in general, eminently practical. Then, over and above this general trustworthiness, see how these books, compiled as they are by various minds, are suited to our manifold needs; and what an excellence they have of their own, even if we, with our iciness, cannot always appreciate their warmth, or, in our lack of sympathy, fail to discern the many wants they meet! How plain, how faithful, how fervid, is the "Communicant's Manual" (Bell & Sons), by him to whom we owe so much, Mr Sadler of Honiton! How full of love, and tenderness, and humility, how sober, how marvellously comprehensive, are Josephine Fletcher's "Prayers and Meditations" (Rivingtons), commended to us by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol! How admirably adapted to the poor, and to any of us who wish, with our crucified Lord, to become poor, is the well-known "Manual" (Masters) of Heygate, already in its seventeenth edition! How good, how simple, how devout, the "Christian's Plain Guide" (Masters), by the Vicar of Arksey! How striking the occasional prayers, the holy longings, the addresses to our Saviour, in that "Treasury of Devotion" (Rivingtons), which was effectual in preparing our revered Bishop Hamilton for his account! How scriptural and how simple Mr Abner Brown's "Manual of Short Prayers," (Wertheim, Macintosh, & Hunt). What sobriety, what true devoutness, what thorough regard to practice, have we in the "Devotions for Holy Communion" (James Parker & Co.), edited by Mr Carter! What a blessing has Canon King been to us in compiling that other "Communicants' Manual" (Mozley & Smith), so valuable for meditation, suggestion, thanksgiving!

How thoroughly are prayer and reading blended for us in "Communion with God" (S. P. C. K), put forth by the Tract Committee! How helpful for the unlearned are those "Eighteen Prayers" (W. Macintosh), which come to us, as it were, under the wings of the spirit of Simeon! How happily, in this generation of half believers, has Dr Chaplin shown us, in his "Benedicite" (John Murray), the way in which "devotional feelings may be roused by the contemplation of many of the familiar objects around us"! Excellent, too, in its plainness, its thoroughness, its loyalty to the Church of England, is the "Churchman's Manual" (W. Wells Gardner), by Mr Venables; and very excellent those "Prayers for the Morning and Evening" (Mozley), by E. H. T., framed on the model and almost in the language of the great Bishop of Winchester of the 17th century; and most excellent the well-known "Churchman's Guide" (Masters), which we owe to the faith and piety of the noble-hearted Robert Brett. Then, too, how well are met, nowadays, the peculiar wants of classes and of individuals! Are we imperilled by the tremendous cares or the more tremendous coldness incident to the clergy? Bishop Armstrong shows us, in his "Pastor in the Closet," the rest which comes from intercession, the warmth which revives under work. Does happy childhood need just a check, a gracious call or two from God? Mr Wilkinson of St Peter's (at whose very name there rise up, in the minds of thousands, thoughts of

high Christian duty and fearless courage and unflinching faithfulness) has not only set before us the true principles of the devotional life, but has given us simple, loving, earnest, childlike "Prayers for Children" (William Macintosh), which have among other things this special merit, that in self-examination they do not *suggest* to a child what he may never have heard of. Are we at a loss for "Prayers for Parish Schools"? (W. Wells Gardner): Mr Walsham How has supplied us with these. Are our own dear boys a care to us when they leave some of the more direct influences of mother and home? The Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, has cared for them also, leaving only to *us* (if I may venture to criticise for a moment what he has done) the task of *shortening* his "Private Prayers for School Boys" (Mozley & Smith). Is our household unable to attend matins at the house of prayer? The author of "Plain Words" is again beside us, with his "Daily Family Prayers for Churchmen" (W. Wells Gardner), which is in accordance with, and greatly derived from, the Church prayers; or Bishop Ashton Oxenden, with his "Cottage Family Prayers (Hatchards), twenty-second edition, in which, however, one misses sacramental teaching; or Mr Tuttiett, with his "Household Prayers for Working Men" (W. Wells Gardner, eighth thousand), a really delightful little manual; or the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, with those short and comprehensive Family Prayers (taken from Edward VI.'s Primer), suitable alike for rich and poor. Is illness upon us? Ernest Hawkins has left us the "Sickbed Services" (W. Macintosh), very scriptural, very short and plain, light for the hand, and easy to the eye. Are we anxious to use aright each season of penitence? Earnestly may be commended an unknown benefactor's aid, in "Devotions for Lent and Passiontide" (Masters).

It would neither be brave nor truthful in me to pass over in silence the terrible tendency of a few (so far as I am aware, *very* few) manuals, now apparently in vogue among us. I allude more especially, not to the "Pathway of Faith," which is very good in the main, though unwise, in my judgment, in laying undue stress on prayers for the dead, and on priestly *direction*, but to the "English Catholic's Vade Mecum," which simply *teems* with Mariolatry, and to "Oratory Worship," which is full enough of intolerable ceremonies to make St Augustine turn in his grave. Let us all—bishops, presbyters, deacons, lay-people—have the courage to speak out with one voice against the introduction of these Romanisms into our glorious British Church, and say, "We daren't use them, we don't want them, and we won't have them."

III. Lastly, lest we should be content with protesting against others instead of watching ourselves, it may be well to bring forward, very briefly, and in such a way as to invite thought rather than discussion, some practical suggestions as to the use of devotional books.

(i.) Let us see that they are not a *snare* to us in keeping us back either from God's precious Word, or from those humble words of our own which are precious to God. It is often far better to kneel down with the Psalter before us, especially the 119th Psalm, and so to pour out our heart before God, God preparing our heart, and then hearkening thereto.

(ii.) Let us not deem it a matter of conscience, necessarily to repeat the *whole* of those petitions which occur in any given book recommended to

us. Lengthened forms, such as those of Hele, however helpful to elderly persons, may be rather a hindrance to others.

(iii.) Let us from time to time *vary* our manuals according to our varying needs—now breathing Holy Scripture with Bishop Andrewes, now enlarging our supplications with Jeremy Taylor, now embodying our anxieties with Dr Johnson, now sanctifying common employments like Macready, now rising and falling in the verses of George Herbert.

(iv.) Let us be always using the Book of Common Prayer. It is the very best of all the volumes in which man speaks to God. As there is no religious body in the world like the Church of England, so are there no devotions more pure than hers, more thoroughly chastened, more exactly the echo of Holy Writ, more faithful to God, more edifying to man, more intent on the one great Name whereby we must be saved.

(v.) And remembering Him, let us ever be praying in God's House as in our own, in our joys quite as much as in our sorrows, in the Eucharist itself no less than while penitently preparing for it, as Christians marked by His sacred Cross, and wishing to follow Him in a constantly crucified life. For, as Bishop Wilson reminds us, "true devotion consists in having our hearts always *devoted* to God." And each time we pray in the Holy Ghost, it is in order that we may be built up in our most holy faith, earnestly keeping ourselves in the love of God, and humbly looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Rev. Dr Frederic W. Farrar, Head Master of Marlborough College.

Of the general advantage which we may all derive from the study of religious and devotional books, no one, I suppose, will for a moment doubt. In every age such books have been found necessary to counteract the torpor and selfishness of life's ordinary course. In every age men have needed to be warned in the words of Dante, that

> "Not on flowery beds, nor under shade
> Of canopy reposing, heaven is won;"

and we who are living in a prosperous condition of society, amid long peace and unbroken ease and increasing luxury, need more than ever to be reminded that, whether we will or no, the cross was a terrible reality, and that there is a stern necessity for the law which bade us take it up. Now a book can hardly be reckoned as a religious or devotional book at all, if it does not inculcate these lessons by teaching us that repentance must be something more than the flash of a transient emotion—that in the conquest over sin, long and painful struggle is necessary before we can turn "rout into resistance, and resistance into victory"—that the path of a holy life is no path of primrose, but steep and uphillward, and that none can tread it without the girded loin and the burning lamp. We see in such books that others, nobler and better than ourselves, yet regarded their lives until the very end as a battle that must be fought and a race that

must be run ; and their voices, whether near or far away, tell us that the sunlit heights which they reached at last can only be attained by earnest toil. And thus, when we read religious books, we are interchanging in silence with the saints of God the deepest experience of the Christian life. They suffered as we suffer, and we share their sacred consolations ; they were tempted as we are tempted, and they tell us the way of their escape ; they sinned as we have sinned, and we learn from them where they found forgiveness. Thus every true religious book becomes a treasure-house of eternal principles. And consider what a wealth of such books we possess ! To mention but a very few : there is the "*Imitatio Christi*," with its brief, quivering sentences, its exalted passion, its sublime soliloquy of the soul with God ; there are the "*Confessions of St Augustine*," painting, as no uninspired hand has ever painted, the anguish of guilty pleasure, and the joys of bitter repentance ; there are the two great allegories of John Bunyan, with their vivid pictures of every phase and emotion of the Christian walk ; there are the thoughts of Pascal, with their masculine logic and terrible solemnity ; there are the "*Sacra Privata*" of Bishop Wilson, with their lucid simplicity and untroubled faith ; there are the writings of St François de Sales, with their beautiful images and soothing tenderness ; there are Coleridge's "*Aids to Reflection*," to which so many in these troubled days have owed the sure basis of a manly faith ; not least by any means there is the "*Holy Living and Dying*" of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, of whom it has been said that he "cannot speak of a woman, a bird, or a flower, without embalming it in so deep a tenderness as to make it seem like the fragment of a lyric song,"—the most eloquent of divines, I had almost said of men ; and if I had, Demosthenes would have nodded approval and Cicero expressed assent." Nor think it strange if to these immortal books I add the "*Exercitia*" of Ignatius Loyola. On almost every page of that strange manual the faithful son of the Church of England will find thoughts that are revolting and narratives which are grotesque ; but in reading this and other Romish works, however deep and frequent may be his dissent, the earnest reader may well be powerfully stirred by the overwhelming intensity with which they realise the great conviction that all earthly interests put together are but as dust in the balance in comparison with one eternal duty, and that it can profit less than nothing to gain the whole world, yet lose the soul. And the fact that profit of the highest kind may thus be derived from the books of good men with whom we most fundamentally disagree, leads me to say that to any mind which is active in the research, and catholic in the appreciation, of good, the most religious and the most devotional books—the books most stimulative of effort and most elevating in influence—may often be those not meant to be specially religious, or directly devotional at all. I make the statement in its broadest sense. The spiritual life may indeed be fed by reading religious and devotional books, but to me it seems that it can be fed far more surely by the cultivation of that frame of mind which claims all that is pure for religion, and hallows all that is noble into devotion. From lack of time to explain, I may be misunderstood, but I plead for culture ; I plead for largeness of appreciation ; I plead for width of view. I would claim it as our ideal that our religion be coextensive with our manhood, and our devotion with our life. I would claim them for the intellect as well as for the spirit ; and for the daily walk and the daily work as well as for the

closet and the Church. Were a man a heathen, were he a Buddhist, were he a Mohammedan, were he a sceptic, were he anything—yet, if there be in him but one spark of the divine light amid his darkness, however much we may deplore his creed, however much we may detest his other doctrines—yet if, even in spite of his creed, he have been enlightened to say anything good or true, or noble, we will not call him an enemy, and even if we do, will still say, "Fas est et ab hoste doceri." Deep, for instance, as may be the damage which has been wrought in ill-conditioned intellects by a study of the classics, terrible as is the mischief which certainly has been done by the pernicious folly of holding that the perfume is not perfume without the dead flies which putrefy within it, nor an edition an edition if it does not preserve and perpetuate the vilest of its stains—in spite of this, I bear in mind that St Paul has enshrined quotations from Epimenides and Menander in the sacred page, and I say that there must be few of those who hear me who, having profited morally as well as intellectually from the study in a Christian spirit of pagan literature, would not be able to exclaim with Erasmus, "Profanum dici non debet quicquid pium est; et fortasse latius se fundit Spiritus Christi quam nos interpretamur,"—Nothing which is moral ought to be called profane, and perhaps the Spirit of Christ is outpoured more widely than we admit. We may smile at the "Sancte Vergili, ora pro nobis" of the enthusiastic scholar, and hardly can endorse the advice of Bishop Butler that it would be good for our sermons if we drew on the Satires of Juvenal; but I do say with the emphasis of full conviction, that a man may study devotional literature too exclusively—that there is only too much danger lest a clergyman of narrow reading should become also a clergyman of narrow understanding—and that it is due to ourselves, due to those whom we teach, due to the age in which we live, due to the cause of truth, due to the dignity of culture, due to that sacred training which cannot be complete if it does not extend from that which is merely professional to all that is purely human, that, if possible, no supremely noble work of human genius should remain unknown to us, that our ears should be quick to recognise what the great Greek thinker calls the voice of the Sibyl, that breath of divine inspiration, which, even when uttered by lips alien as those of Balaam, reaches, by God's aid, through many thousand years. And to all that is great in pagan or in foreign literature I would add all that is great in our own. To me it seems a bigoted and narrow ignorance which denounces all fiction as dangerous. There are works of fiction in this age, and there have been in all ages, of which the purpose is profoundly religious and the influence distinctly devotional;—which not only enshrine deep thought in exquisite language, but which, like the writings of the greatest living master in this field of literature, describes more vividly than whole libraries of sermons, the slow growth, the difficult repentance, the awful nemesis of sin. And I will add further, that in all ages from Æschylus to Dante, and from Dante to Tennyson, all the poets who are essentially great have been the most effective, as they have also been the most exquisite, teachers of religious truth. None would dream for a moment of denying how much the very saintliest soul may be ennobled by the glorious purity of Milton, the pathetic tenderness of Cowper, the exquisite serenity of Wordsworth, the angelic sweetness and soothing calm of the saintly Keble. But I mean others besides these.

Who, for instance, has not learnt from Shakespeare—though sometimes he laid the incense of his genius upon unhallowed altars—lessons as deep and true as any that can be found out of the sacred page. And if I may mention that great living laureate, whose genius has never been prostituted nor his power abused, are not sermons of extraordinary force concentrated in such few lines as these from the "Sea Dreams"—

> "He that wrongs his friend
> Wrongs himself more, and ever bears about
> A silent court of justice in himself;
> Himself the judge and jury; and himself
> The prisoner at the bar, ever condemned,
> And that drags down his life."

Or, to quote but one where we might quote a hundred instances,—as these from the "Idylls"—

> "And that he sinned is not believable,
> For look upon his face: but, if he sinned,
> The sin that practice burns into the blood,
> And not the one dark hour that brings remorse,
> Shall stamp us after of whose fold we be."

But though I am very far from regarding as superfluous this protest on behalf of wide reading,—though I consider that *any* reading which brings us into communion with the greatest and wisest souls, dealing with great and worthy subjects, may be, in the best sense, religious teaching,—though I think that by narrowing too much our conception of what is religious and devotional we may lose the glorious liberty of religion, and dull the fairest bloom of devotion,—it is time for me now to supplement what I have said about the usefulness of religious and devotional books, by endeavouring to point out certain tendencies which, especially perhaps in modern times, are apt to characterise not a few of them—which are gradually creeping from the works of other communions into our own,—and against the subtle dangers of which I would say—not, God forbid, in the spirit of a partisan, but in the spirit of a simple Christian—that we ought to be on our guard.

1. And the first danger in the use of such books is the danger of that excessive introspection, that morbid self-analysis, by which men are too often tempted into guilt or goaded into despair. And this danger leads to, and springs from, and is mingled with many others. I would do justice to the convictions of all; I would be guilty of uncharity to none; but I do say that there are in existence manuals of devotion, and above all of confirmation and confession, with which not only every faithful son of the Church of England, but every man who would rightly possess his soul, should be very careful how he meddles. I will not use one unnecessarily irritating word, but I will say that with that spirit in which they have their root,—the spirit which thrusts all kinds of human intermediates between the soul and God; the spirit which, instead of saying to a sinner "Go as He bids you, straight to your Saviour; clasp the feet, lean on the arm, walk in the strength, speak face to face with the immediate presence of your God," would bid him rather lean on the possibly feeble arm, and trust in the possibly blind guidance of a mere fellow-sinner like himself, and so support his tottering steps upon a reed that may at any moment break beneath him;—the spirit that would dabble in the most sacred

secrets of the microcosm, it may be, are often ignorant, and it may be a not always holy hand,—with *that* spirit I have no sympathy; nay, with every nerve of my moral being I reject it as dangerous to the man who fosters it, dangerous to the man who is the victim of it, and dangerous to the society in which it is practised; as alien to the teachings of the Reformation; and if that be thought lightly of, as irreconcilable with the doctrine of Christ. At special crises, but not as a system,—under exceptional circumstances, but not as a habit,—it may be necessary to utter or to listen to the confidences of an erring life; but it is for their own sakes that I would humbly warn any of my brethren whom my voice can reach, that though it may be possible to pass a finger "fresh-bathed in the ice-brook" through the lamp's fierce flame, yet that it is not any man—above all it is not every young man,—who

> "Can hold a fire in his hand
> By thinking of the frosty Caucasus;"

and that, as it may be most injurious to himself that he should be led to look into the secrets of a sinful heart, so the very warnings by which he would terrify another into such confessions may in themselves be not only dangerous but deadly—Pharos lights, more perilous for their seeming beneficence than the very rock on which they stand,—Pharos lights which, like that old Alexandrian beacon, have been known ere now to wreck the very vessel they were meant to warn.

2. Then secondly, many devotional books require caution, because they foster the selfish instincts to the imperilling of the social. A life which, in endeavouring to realise the awfulness of our own immortality, forgets that we are not our own, and neither live nor die to ourselves, is at least an imperfect, if it be not a useless, life; and God's clear revelation of His will that we should prove our love to Him primarily by our services to our brethren, shows us that we were not sent into this world to absorb ourselves in a selfish effort after a personal salvation. "They ask me," said St François de Sales, "they ask me for secrets for arriving at perfection; as for me, I know no other secret than this, namely to love God with all the heart, and our neighbour as ourselves." Yet in how many manuals of devotion is the latter all but ignored! *Secum habitavit* is the ideal of the monk and of the mystic, but "He went about doing good" is the very epitome of the life of Christ.

In this point even the "Imitatio Christi"—the crown and flower of all religious books—is glaringly deficient. Exquisite as are its teachings, it leaves out the most essential characteristic of the very life of which it professes to point the example; and I have often wondered at the strange fact that the book of a heathen—the little golden book of the "Meditations of Marcus Aurelius," which, though the work of a heathen, may be so translated into the thoughts of Christianity as to be made one of the most religious and one of the most devotional books ever written—is, in this respect, and in the true meaning of the word, essentially more Christian than the "Imitatio" itself.

3. And there is a third danger in some religious books, namely, sectarianism. We ought to mistrust a page which bristles with the Shibboleths and Sibboleths of sects. Every truly religious book, every Christian book, which can really help us in the life of personal holiness, should be

based on creeds and on the Decalogue, on the great broad, indisputable commandments and verities of Christianity, not on the favourite fragments of dogma that are thrust into prominence by divided parties. Surely the loud voices of theological hatred ought to be hushed into silence before the Great White Throne! We go to a religious book, not to be pampered by assurances of our superior orthodoxy, nor to thank God that we are not as this Pharisee or that Sadducee, but to be brightened, to be humbled, to be ashamed, to be consoled. A book which encourages divisions, a book which develops differences, a book which shows the trail of sectarian self-complacency, can hardly be a good religious book at all. It will begin by making us love a Church more than the truth, and continue by making us love our party more than our church, and end, as has well been prophesied, by making us love ourselves more than all. And surely for those who love God, and believe from their hearts in the religion of Christ, it is in these days nothing less than madness, nothing less than the "dementation preceding doom," to be hurling at each other hard words and angry persecution about things infinitesimally small, at a time—and I would ask you to perpend words spoken by one who knows—at a time when youths at the university are denying the possibility of miracles, and almost debating the existence of a God; and even boys at our public schools, saturated with the doubts and inuendoes which are scattered broadcast in well-nigh every newspaper and well-nigh every magazine, have been known to refuse the rite of Confirmation with the open declaration that they do not believe the articles of the Christian faith.

4. Here there are three dangers—sacerdotalism, selfishness, sectarianism; and thus, while we may be deeply thankful for many noble religious books, of which some are wholly free from these evils, yet since in every one of them there are some traces of human imperfections, either limitations of view, or errors of judgment, or narrownesses of charity, or deficiences of style, we may be most of all thankful for this, that there is one Teacher whose divine counsels are perfect and entire, wanting nothing; one source where we may find truth without error, and light without darkness, and the river of the water of life with no shadows of stain upon its crystal waves. The brightest lustre of the brightest followers of Jesus is but as the twilight; He is as the sun. The most eloquent of His servants does but interpret Him with feeble utterance and stammering lips—He is the Word of God. The unapproachable perfections of His teaching is no less a proof of His divinity than the utter sinlessness of His nature; and if, in an age when myriads are forsaking Him, His voice appeals to us in the old sad question, "Will ye also go away?" we can but answer, and we do answer in very deep humility, but with the whole conviction of our intellect and the utter fulness of our love, "Lord, to whom should we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

Mr John M. Clabon.

The subject is a wide one. I shall give you the simple views of a lay Churchman, founded on his own experience. A leading idea will be "that it is better to digest pages than devour books." "Assuredly," said Thomas à Kempis, "in the day of judgment it will not be required of us what we have read, but what we have done."

George Herbert says "that the parson's library is a holy life;" but he does not shut out books, for he soon speaks of "the Scriptures and other good books." The Bible must, of course, be the first among religious and devotional books. The good books to be grouped round it are principally those which best comment on and illustrate its contents. But it will be well to seek God also in His works of *creation*, and in the pages of *history*.

It requires not the aid of science to see around us the design of a personal Creator. As we look upwards to the starry firmament, and consider the arrangements which give us light and heat, day and night, summer and winter; as we turn our eyes downwards, and see how all our wants are provided for, the evidences of design abound everywhere. The growth of plants and trees, the myriad forms of life, the instinct of animals, the reason of man, fill the inquiring mind with wonder at the wisdom which designed and created them all. "Natural philosophy," says Dr Barrow, "the contemplation of the visible system before us; observing the various appearances therein, and inquiring into their causes; reflecting on the order, connection, and harmony of things; considering their original source and final design; how doth it serve to work in us pious affections of admiration, reverence, and love towards our great Creator, whose 'eternal divinity is clearly seen,' whose 'glory is declared.'"

It is said that the study of nature leads to scepticism; but how seldom! Sir Isaac Newton, in his early career, was disposed to infidelity, but became an earnest believer. Professor Tyndall, who, in his Belfast address, abandoned the conception of creative acts, and discerned in matter the promise and potency of every form and quality of life, admitted, in his preface to the published address, that it was not in hours of clearness and vigour that this doctrine of material atheism commended itself to his mind, but that in the presence of stronger and healthier thought, it ever dissolved and disappeared. Happy they, who know the boundary between reason and faith—who, unable by reason to find out how the star was created out of nothing, or why the blade springs up from the seed, can elevate the question into the regions of faith, and believe, though they cannot fathom, the evidence which teems on every side; seen by the telescope in the paths of ether; by the microscope in the water drop.

Another help to religious and devotional books is history. The universal prevalence of belief in deity, the unvarying sameness in the structure of man, and the growing proofs that all languages were formed out of one original language, prove, as we are taught by the Bible, that all of us descended from the same pair. "The perusal of history," says Dr Barrow, "how may it instruct and encourage us in piety, while therein we trace the paths of God in man; how the Lord and Judge of the world protecteth, prospereth, blesseth, rewardeth innocence and integrity; how He crosseth, defeateth, punisheth outrage and iniquity; managing things with admirable

temper of wisdom, to the good of mankind and advancement of His own glory."

The main question of the subject is, What religious and devotional books are to be recommended for general reading?

THE BIBLE, first, of course; the Book of books, written by holy men of God, moved thereto by the Holy Ghost.

The Bible is its own witness. Written in various ages, by men of various nations, station, and education, it yet forms one harmonious whole. It is in accord with the evidences of design: of other history. Its morality is perfect. The sublimity of its truth glows on every page. The glorious beauty of its simple eloquence, the unapproachable grandeur of its poetry, stamp it as divine. It is the Book of the Creator, given to the creature as a guide along his erring path.

The more the Christian trusts himself to the Bible, the better. There are in it things hard to be understood; but the faith of the humble student fathoms them. Doubts seldom arise on the words of the Book itself. Tradition, the practices of divers Churches, the wordy comments of all ages, create difficulties which do not arise to the faithful Christian, who goes not beyond its pages. The sacrament of Holy Communion well illustrates this. How simple is the narrative of the gospels: "Take, eat, this is My body;" "drink ye all of it, for this is My blood." Who, knowing these inspired words, as the bread and wine is received, can doubt the presence of Jesus in them? But the body and blood of Jesus are in heaven, and it follows that the presence is a spiritual one. The errors of transubstantiation, consubstantiation, and mere remembrance, arise out of the descriptions and comments of the numerous writers on the subject.

Commentaries are not to be put aside; but it is best only to resort to them when the text requires explanation. I recommend that of D'Oyly and Mant. It contains the comments of our leading divines. There is great variety, and orthodox soundness, in small compass.

To Commentaries may be added the first volume of Horne's "Summary of the Evidence for the Genuineness, Authenticity, and Uncorrupted Preservation and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures." The subsequent volumes of recent editions should be kept out of view; for Germanistic notions have crept in. Bishop Hall's "Contemplations on the Old and New Testaments" are also to be recommended; and Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ, or the Truth of the Scripture History of St Paul," Keith's "Evidence of Prophecy," and Elliott's "Horæ Apocalypticæ."

To those who doubt, "Infidelity, its Cause and Cure," by the Rev. David Nelson, will be found most useful. The chapters on fulfilled prophecy and on natural phenomena are particularly able. His statement of the "all-powerful remedy," the internal consciousness of being, and depravity, and creation, and deity, are most convincing.

If difficulties remain, let us remember that now we see through a glass darkly—now, we know only in part. The child, in simple faith, must trust to the experience and knowledge of the parent, and obey. The ignorant must trust in the learned. Man must have faith in God. The time will come, when the faithful shall see Him face to face; shall know, as He now knows us.

I object to histories of the Life of Jesus. The writers substitute glowing language of their own for the simple eloquence of the gospels. An

unbiblical glare abounds. The expression of doubt creeps in. An instance may be given from Dr Farrar's recent book. St Matthew says, that after the resurrection of our Lord, many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. Dr Farrar's description is that as the earthquake rolled the stones from the sepulchres, it seemed to the imaginations of many to have disimprisoned the spirits of the dead, who, after Christ had arisen, *appeared* to linger in the holy city. The believer in inspiration accepts St Matthew's words as literally true, and must therefore discard Dr Farrar's paraphrase.

The Apocrypha should be ever at hand, though not now always bound up with our Bibles. "It is to be read," says our Church, "for example of life, and instruction of manners." Beautiful, indeed, and full of wisdom and piety are the prayer of rejoicing of Tobit, and the song of the three holy children, and the wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, the son of Jesus.

Next among devotional and religious books must be "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church,"—a book without a rival among human compositions. We have in it the thoughts and prayers and praises of holy men of all ages. May it descend to our posterity, unaltered and unmutilated!

As adjuncts to the prayer-book may be mentioned "Wheatley's Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer, containing the substance of everything liturgical in Bishop Sparrow, and all former ritualists and commentators on the subject;" Dr Harold Browne's "Exposition of the Articles of the Church of England;" and Dr Stephens' "Book of Common Prayer, with notes, legal and historical."

And now, after the Bible, and the essence of many commentators on it, and the prayer-book, and the best expositions of it, how next shall our library be enlarged?

What shall be said of controversial books? The fewer the better. During the first two hundred years after the Reformation, the errors of Rome formed the subject of most religious books. The errors we had left behind were more thought of than the great truths in which both Churches agreed. We are wiser now, and think more of the possibility of unity, not in error, but in truth. Let the learned study controversial books, that they may be prepared at all points. The unlearned had better leave them alone. It is difficult for one who busies himself in disputations to preserve the simple mind of Christ.

Some books must be named specifically, as books for all, and for all time.

The "Imitation of Jesus Christ" is the best devotional book ever written by one man. It is for every Church, for every person. I must give two quotations:—

"On this sin, that a man inordinately loveth himself, almost all dependeth, whatsoever is thoroughly to be overcome; which evil being once subdued, there will ensue great peace and tranquillity."

"Why dost thou here gaze about, since this is not the place of thy rest? In heaven ought to be thy dwelling, and all earthly things are to be looked on as they forward thy journey thither. All things pass away, and thou

with them. Beware thou cleave not unto them, lest thou be entangled and perish."

"The Pilgrim's Progress" must not be left out of our list; but it must be read with this caution: that God has given us two sacraments, as generally necessary to salvation, and that Bunyan conducts his pilgrims to the Heavenly City with bare mention of adult baptism, and with no mention of Holy Communion. We Churchmen must note the omissions, as well as the merits, of his great book.

An allegory cannot be mentioned without recommending "The Distant Hills" and "The Shadow of the Cross" by the Rev. W. Adams, and Mrs Gatty's "Parables from Nature."

The books for family prayer are numerous, and each may make his own selection. Among old books Bishop Andrews' "Devotions," and among recent ones Earl Nelson's "Book for Family Worship," will be found especially good. If any be in want, let him resort to the Book of Common Prayer. The general Confession, the general Thanksgiving, and the Lord's Prayer, said by the whole family, with the Collect for the day, and the prayer for the Church militant, or parts of the Litany, will form an acceptable morning or evening service.

Poetry has only as yet been mentioned, in connection with the Bible. Happily, our books of psalms and hymns are full of real poetry. It is well that for different Churches, and different schools of thought, we have many of them. "Hymns Ancient and Modern" is deservedly a favourite, both for Church and home use. There may accompany it, on the shelf, the works of Milton and Cowper, and those of George Herbert, Reginald Heber, Felicia Hemans, Henry Kirke White, and the saintly Keble.

Among evidences may be selected Bishop Butler's great book, "The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature," and the "Evidences" of Paley and Addison.

Among books of divinity should be especially named Bishop Beveridge's "Thesaurus Theologicus, or Complete System of Divinity."

And among biographies, the life of the holy and humble Bishop Ken, whose will contains a profession of faith, which we should always remember: "As to my religion, I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Faith, professed by the whole Church before the division of East and West; more particularly I die in the communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross."

The works of Dean Hook and Dean Goulburn are to be commended, as most useful and practical.

The number of religious and devotional books which might be mentioned is legion. But most of them repel, rather than attract. There is immoderate length and much dreariness. They are only to be read, as Dean Stanley said of Baxter's "Saint's Rest," in the abridgment of an abridgment. You will do well if you study the books I have named, and books of extracts from other books, such as Brogden's "Illustrations of the Liturgy and Ritual," and "Catholic Safeguards," and Arnold's "Short Helps to Daily Devotion."

After much seeking I select a few rare gems from our best writers, to give an idea of their style and merit:—

Bishop Wilson.—"The closer union we have with the world, the less

is our union with God." "We know not what we lose, when we ask to be delivered from our afflictions." "How unworthy an opinion would a stranger have of Christ, if he were to judge what Christ was by the lives of those who call themselves His followers." "A fault which humbles a man is of more use to him than a good action which puffs him up with pride."

Bishop Jeremy Taylor.—"In all afflictions, seek for patience rather than comfort; if thou preservest that, this will return."

Dr Hackett.—"But as if many spouts should open into one cistern, so all comforts conspire to meet in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Nothing else but the actual enjoying of heaven is above it. The Church can bring forth no better. Children that are come to age can ask no more than the portion of their Father's goods that come unto them; and what is that but the blood of Christ? and this is the New Testament in that blood. Christ is mine, His body is mine, His blood is mine, all is mine! Oh, be glad and rejoice, and give honour to the Lord God omnipotent, for the marriage of the Lamb is come!"

Spinckes.—"By labour and pain, with weeping and mourning, is the kingdom of heaven obtained; but by honour and ease is paradise lost." "Let us be willing to die when God calls; and look upon a speedy summons out of this world as an act of mercy, to prevent the many sins and calamities of a longer life."

The most remarkable book I have read for years is "The Autobiography of John Brown the Cordwainer." It is not because it is decidedly High Church in character that I commend it, for it sometimes goes in that direction beyond me. But it breathes completely the spirit of practical Christianity, and is eminently calculated to lead others along the straight path which the cordwainer travelled. It contains the history of a stately and magnificent church, forming one side of a quadrangle, embracing a clergy house for the vicar and three curates, the schools for boys, girls and infants, master's and mistress's houses, hospital with dispensary and nursing institute, church institute with library, savings bank, orphanage and almshouses, to make poverty honourable; all built by a cotton spinner, for the district inhabited by his numerous workpeople. There was an endowment, and a big stone in the church wall, with an inscription to say that all the seats were free and unappropriated for ever; and weekly communion; and an offertory for the sick and needy, and for church expenses. "And," said Tomkins, the foreman, in describing the place to John Brown, "don't the clergy just look up the people! Why, they are about all day long looking after rich and poor alike." The factory girls had an allotment garden, and got up at five to cultivate flowers to decorate the church. The book contains more pictures than I have time to describe. There is a grand old man, who came five miles regularly to church, and NEVER MISSED HOLY COMMUNION. My Lord, I hope the time will soon come when, in every church, there will be Holy Communion, Low, Broad, and High, of Churchmen. Whoever miss it will become fewer and fewer. There is a squire who looked well after his estate, and whose directions to his steward were, "If there isn't work for the people, make it." There is a farmer who, when cows had got into his field, and his men were debating *how*, shouted to them, "Don't stand talking, turn 'em out, and mend the fence." Turning to his son, he said: "These fellows remind me of our parson's sermon on the origin of evil; he spent his time and ours by trying to find out how evil got into the world,

when he'd a deal better have been telling us how to drive it out." There is a meeting, at which a lecturer said that Church property is national property. "Not a bit of it," said Tomkins in reply. "It is Church property, given by Churchmen for Church purposes, and it doesn't matter a pin whether it was given by a king, or a peer, or a mill-owner; it's given to God and the Church for ever, for the good of the nation."

I conclude with an extract from Jeremy Taylor.—"Be doing actions of religion as often as thou canst; and worldly pleasures as seldom; that if thou be surprised by sudden death, it may be odds but thou art taken at thy prayers."

ADDRESS.

The Rev. F. F. Goe.

It is important to observe that state of the public mind, with respect to religion, which has led to so great a demand for religious and devotional books. At one period the evidences of Christianity were chiefly studied; at another, its controversies have been the principal object of attention. But at the present time we notice a widespread awakening on the great question of personal religion and experience. The large numbers attending Mr Moody's meetings, the Conferences on Holiness at Brighton, Oxford, Hull, and other places, and the marvellous success of Parochial Missions, all testify to this tendency of the public mind in regard to religious truth. I will first mention some books which I think are calculated to be useful to anxious inquirers and beginners in religion:—Goulburn's "Thoughts on Personal Religion," and "Pursuit of Holiness;" Oxenden's "Pathway of Safety," "Christian Life," and "Earnest Communicant;" Everard's "Day by Day," and "Not your Own," very useful for candidates for Confirmation; and Wilkinson's "Instructions in the Devotional Life."

A book of devotion for young people should contain the following helps:—(1) A judicious selection of questions for self-examination; for though I agree with a previous speaker that a morbid analysis of thought and motive is to be discouraged, yet our views of sin are apt to be so superficial, that a few searching questions for self-examination are, I think, likely to be profitable. (2) Plain directions as to behaviour in the house of prayer; hints for making the best use of the quarter or half-hour spent in devotion, morning and evening, and help in preparing for the Lord's Supper. (3) Meditations, with a view to suggesting suitable topics for prayer. (4) Forms of prayer, in which earnestness, simplicity, and definiteness should be the points aimed at.

But in the preparation of such a book as this, two things should be especially borne in mind, and I mention them because they point to a very serious deficiency which I have observed in some of the books which I have seen:—First, the person using such a book should be discouraged from making it the substitute for direct converse with God. Scripture teaches that, when the penitent sinner receives the forgiveness of sin through faith in Christ, he loses that spirit of bondage again to fear, which prompted Adam to hide himself from the presence of God, and he receives the spirit of adoption, whereby he may cry, "Abba, Father." His privilege in drawing near to God is indicated by the word παρρησια, freedom of speech: thus we have, "let us come boldly to the throne of grace." The pardoned sinner is authorised to approach God as a child comes to his father, and to use a reverent, yet filial freedom, in pouring into his Heavenly Father's ear all his desires and needs. But if he makes it his constant habit to use a form in his private devotions, he will be in danger of losing much of the benefit and comfort to be derived from unrestrained communion with God.

Secondly, such a book should distinctly set forth the ground and the condition of the penitent sinner's acceptance with God. It should be carefully pointed out that the one

all-sufficient ground of acceptance is the finished work of Jesus Christ—the Lord our Righteousness—and that no acts of devotion or contrition on the sinner's part can add anything to its efficacy. To show how defective on this vital point some devotional books are, let me quote from Kettlewell's "Companion for the Penitent." In stating the design of his book, he says:—"I lead the penitent to express repentance in such acts as (through the merits of Christ) are the truest atonement for sins." In another book, by a well-known living clergyman, I find a form of prayer with this heading,—"A Prayer to Jesus, that, by His holy life and conversation, He would make satisfaction for our transgressions." Such statements as these seem subversive of the gospel. They appear to imply that the atonement of Christ was not perfect; whereas, we read that, on the cross, He said, Τετελεσται, It is finished; and that "God hath made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." Hooker's sermon on Justification nobly declares this truth, and our Church teaches that, on the cross, Christ "made (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

Nor is it of less importance that, in all books of this kind, the condition of the penitent sinner's acceptance with God should be fully and simply set forth. To show how sadly calculated to mislead the inquirer with respect to this matter are some of our devotional manuals, allow me to quote again from the latter of the two books to which allusion has been already made. The author is insisting on what he is pleased to term "the ordinance of confession," and he writes thus:—"It is the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ which alone can heal the diseases of our souls, and quicken in us the vigour of restored spiritual life. But the application of this grace is through the ministry of His priests." Now, surely the teaching of God's Word is, that it is not upon the ministry of the priest, but upon the faith of the penitent, that the bestowal of pardon depends; and that faith in the Lord Jesus is the one only condition of justification: "To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." It is because these fundamental truths are too often overlooked or denied in devotional books, that I have felt it my duty to call attention to them.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. Thomas Barker.

I INTEND to confine myself to a very narrow branch of the subject. I take it for granted that when we give religious books to our people we generally give them one at a time, and that they generally use one book at a time; and whether it be a book suited for Lent or Advent, or any other season, or given to them permanently; whether they use it for a year or half a year, or longer, for the time being it is the only book that they use, and therefore for the time being they are totally under its influence. If it has a bad influence, so much the worse for them, and so much the worse for the discharge of our responsibility. Upon the tables of our booksellers, one meets, and has met for several years, with translations of books of Roman Catholic Theology, edited and adapted for the use of the English Church. Is it possible for those books, however carefully they may be edited, to have cast out from them the ἦθος of Romanism? And is it likely, if our people get accustomed to use these books in their expurgated state, that they will not wish to go further and use similar books less expurgated? Is it likely that a Roman Catholic theologian will be a safer guide, and more likely to write a good book on practical theology, than the devotional writers and theologians of our own Church? We have no reason to suppose that he possesses better abilities, or that he uses those abilities with greater conscientiousness. And if he is to write a good book, he must know human nature, and must know the Bible. Now human nature has to

be known for this purpose—not in the abstract only, but as it commonly exists in society,—and nine-tenths of our adult people either are, have been, or intend to be married,—therefore, it is the wildest dream of a man whose reason is beginning to totter, to expect that a Roman theologian, just because he is an old bachelor, will be able to write a better book of devotion than a married theologian of the Church of England. Then with regard to the knowledge of Holy Scripture—we know what our own Church is; we know the collect, "Blessed Lord, Who hast caused all Holy Scripture to be written for our learning," &c.; we know how in our ordination services, in the first warning for communion in the prayer for the Church militant and elsewhere, our Church's Prayer-Book is crammed full of the principle that everything in the shape of theology must base itself upon God's Word written. If this is the principle of our Church, and it is not carried out in the same spirit or degree by the Romish Church, then, any imagination that their writers are likely to produce better theological or devotional works than our own must imply a denial that the Bible is the best book for enlightening, converting, and saving souls. Such a denial involves a denial of the wisdom, and therefore of the divinity of the Holy Spirit: and that is heresy. These are *à priori* reasons. I have in my hand one of these English adaptations of a Romish book, presumably a very excellent specimen of its kind [Scupoli's "Spiritual Combat"]. It was written by an Italian priest of the 16th century, has gone through more than 200 editions, and has been translated into twelve languages. Now, the characteristics of it are these:—there is not in it a single direction to study Holy Scripture, or to rejoice in the Lord. And although the object of the book is to teach the reader how to resist temptation, and fight against our spiritual enemies, there is not a passage which proves the author to have *known* that our Lord was ever tempted in the wilderness by Satan, still less that He answered each temptation with the words, "It is written;" or to have ever read that passage which, in the Epistles, is the *locus classicus* on the subject of fighting against Satan—the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians: "Put on the whole armour of God; and take the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." And the only idea which he has of any probability of a connection between Holy Scripture and the faith of a dying Christian is to the following effect:—"If Satan attempts to upset your faith by quoting Scripture, be sure it is a garbled quotation. Do not listen to him; answer him that you believe what the Church believes. If he asks, What does the Church believe? say, She believes the truth. If he asks further, What is truth? answer that it is what the Church believes: and let that be your position." Not a word is there about the dying Christian resting his faith on the written Word of God.

The Rev. Canon Tristram.

This matter of private devotion is one upon which our Church seems deliberately to have intended to give her children full liberty. We may remark how in the earlier prayer-books, from the time of Henry VIII. down to the time of Charles I., there were many forms of prayer for private use—those forms became fewer and fewer, until at the last revision in 1662, they were eliminated altogether. It seems as if the Church would teach us that in these matters she wishes her children to swim sometimes without corks—certainly in their private devotion to try so to do as much as possible. I would simply point out a want which I have felt myself in works of devotion for children. It seems to me very dangerous and likely to stunt and dwarf the spiritual life if our children are taught from their youth upwards in their private prayers to use only forms, however carefully we may change those forms and adapt them to their growing years, because private prayer must be essentially different and distinct from public and common worship in which forms are absolutely necessary. Of course the customary prayer of the preacher leading the congregation in a Presbyterian place of worship is rather more of a form to the congregation perhaps than our printed form

is to us. But when we remember that out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh; when we remember that children can lisp God's praises; when we remember how Christ loves the hosannas of little children; when we remember how we are to teach children to speak to their Heavenly Father, surely we ought to encourage them from their earliest years to express their own wants in their own words, childlike even though they be. There is much that would be perhaps irreverent in a grown person which would not be so in a child. Take for instance the little girl who was allowed to have the apples that fell from the tree, but was not allowed to pick them, when she prayed God that the wind might blow the apples down for her. That was a childish prayer, yet it struck me that that child had just learnt the true idea of the spirit of prayer. Now I do not see that our books generally sufficiently guide our children to pray for themselves. There is not sufficient scope for them to tell their own wants to God in their own way. Then, again, we have been reminded how very often these forms are germs, and we all know how those prayers that we were taught at our mothers' knees we never forget; how those expressions and those words and those little outlines of prayer, the germs of our future spiritual converse with God, are never erased from our minds and our habits. But if it be so, of what fearful importance it is that there should be no potential germs of evil in the books which we put into our children's hands. I have found put into the hands of children of my own friends books which I am sure contained the germs of that against which the second speaker so solemnly and eloquently warned us—the spirit of the Romish Confessional; and yet, at the same time, when he warned us against the perils of Romish devotion, I could have wished that he had eliminated such words as "altar," which our Church has deliberately excluded from her formularies, along wit the doctrine the word is meant to teach; that he would not teach to "shield the forehead with the sign," which our Church has nowhere commanded or encouraged, but the use of which she has expressly renounced, because of the abject superstitions to which it led. When with bated breath he spoke of "the unsafe mention of the intercession of saints," "an undue stress on prayers for the dead, and priestly intercession," these seemed very mild denunciations of such terribly potential germs of heresy as are contained in that subtle, unfaithful Romish teaching.

The Bishop of Melbourne.

I UNDERSTAND religious books to be books for religious instruction to help us in our devotions. I do not understand them to mean books of poetry, history, or general literature. Therefore, although I quite agree with Dr Farrar in his eloquent address respecting the use of such latter books, I confine myself to the former. I quite agree with the Rev. Canon King in saying that we may draw from Catholic sources what is useful for ourselves, only I would understand by "Catholic" a much larger class than he probably intended to include in it. But now I would wish to speak of books published by clergymen of our own Church. The founder of this Congress yesterday spoke of the differences between the members of our Church as consisting in words only, rather than being really substantial. Now I do not think that this is so, and I do not think that any man can really in his heart believe it to be so. The use of these Congresses is, as appears to me, not to persuade us that we are all of one heart and mind in the Lord; but to make us bear with one another, and speak of the differences which exist among us with good temper and Christian calmness. I believe that a large number of those from whom I differ on many most important points are themselves built upon the one foundation upon which alone any man can rest—the foundation of Jesus Christ; but I cannot forget that upon that foundation, while there may be laid gold, silver, and precious stones, there may be also wood, hay, and other worthless things; and I do not hesitate to say that of the large number of the religious and

devotional books at present in circulation, to which the Rev. Mr Jelf has alluded, many contain much that is very dangerous. I am not going to mention particular publications, but I feel bound to declare my opinion that there is in many that which is contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England, and contrary to the doctrine of the Word of God; and what I want particularly to press upon you is that every publication, religious and devotional, ought to be tested by the Word of God. A dear friend of mine, a bishop, who had been led by special circumstances, as he told me, to spend a large portion of his time in reading the Scriptures, remarked that it was delightful to live in the atmosphere of the New Testament. Now I wish all persons of every class to test the books which they read by the atmosphere of the New Testament. If a book leads them to study the Scriptures more, and to appreciate the Word of God more highly, and if they feel that in passing from that which is human to that which is divine they are still breathing the same atmosphere, then the book is safe and profitable. But if they feel the tone of the book to be contrary to the tone of Scripture, then they may be assured that it contains dangerous doctrine; and, while there are very few sufficiently intelligent and well educated to separate in what they read the true from the false, the simplest Christian may feel the difference of the atmosphere that he is breathing.

The Dean of Chester.

We have reason to thank Canon King for the excellent spirit in which he introduced this subject. We expected this from him; but that is no reason why we should not express our obligations to him for the starting-point which he gave us. I hope I shall follow his example, although I shall have to touch a delicate and anxious subject. I hope I too can say of myself what Dr Farrar said of himself, that I have never been a partisan, and that, whatever people may be good enough to say of me, I intend never to be a partisan. Canon King has spoken of the fact that our devotional books of this period are to a great extent probably transient. I sincerely hope that this is true of many of them, but transient books may leave a permanent impression; hence it is of importance to us to attend to the character of such books. Canon King says he hopes Thomas À Kempis will never be contraband. I never knew a thoughtful Christian who ever was tempted to such a view. I hope it is equally true that no Englishman will ever view John Bunyan as contraband. Canon King has alluded in a very feeling manner, although with some depreciation, to William Wilberforce's "Practical View." I hope we shall never forget what another Wilberforce has said, I mean Bishop Wilberforce, in the strongest depreciation of the habit which has come among us of making use of books from Roman Catholic sources. Canon King alluded to Sherlock and Hickes: I think in Sherlock and Hickes we have a very different kind of devotion to that which we are now familiar in so many books. He alluded to what an instructed soul would find in the "Golden Grove," but he did not say what he meant by an "instructed soul;" he also said that some of these books did not give instruction in the full system of supernatural assistance which we have in the Christian Church; but he did not define what was meant by "supernatural assistance." I will not say a word about his meaning, for I really do not know it; but some things were said yesterday which induce me to refer to a certain class of books to which I beg leave to call attention; I mean the books used by the clergy themselves, in order to give devotional teaching to their people. I am far from saying that all the books used by the clergy should be used by the people. I sometimes refer to very strange books indeed in preparing my sermons; and I should be very sorry if everybody read all the books which I have had the misfortune to read. So with regard to Theological Manuals. We are in the habit of

studying some very stupid Theological Manuals; they are very useful to us, but I should be very sorry that all should have those Manuals inflicted upon them. But I am now alluding to the books which must be studied by the clergy, if certain opinions which were expressed yesterday are correct. If it is true that only by sacramental confession can mortal sin be remitted, then it is very important to know, what the books are whereby the clergy are trained for this most solemn duty. There is a book in existence called the "Priest in Absolution." Part II. of that book is printed without the name of a publisher; it is said "It has been thought best that this should be confined to the clergy who desire to have at hand a sort of *Vade Mecum* for easy reference in the discharge of their duty as confessors." Now what is understood by having a book for easy reference, when the book is itself very difficult to obtain? I conclude my remarks by a most solemn appeal to this assembly and the public. I ask Mr Carter, I ask Dr Pusey, whether they know of the existence of that book, and approve of its use? If they do, I call upon them to accept the responsibility of this knowledge and approval; if not, then a great deal of the discomfort under which we are suffering will be removed.

The Rev. George Everard, M.A., Vicar of St Mark's, Wolverhampton.

In the few words that I have to say, I should like to mention how great is the importance of a truly good Christian book. Canon Liddon's "Divinity of Christ," Prebendary Thorold's "Presence of Christ," "Grace and Truth," by Dr Mackay, and many such books, I believe, will have an influence which will lead multitudes of souls to the feet of the Lord Jesus. There are two characteristics of Christian books that it seems to me Churchmen should keep in mind—to one of these I need scarcely allude, for the very words which I wish to speak have been already spoken by the Very Rev. Bishop of Melbourne; but I do not think that we can make it of too great importance that *all our religious books should be saturated from cover to cover with the spirit of Holy Scripture.* Let those topics which are prominent in Holy Scripture be kept most prominent in our religious books—the atonement of Christ, the priesthood of Christ, the work of the Holy Spirit, the blessedness of holy charity going down to the little details of every-day life—let those be kept prominent in all Christian books. There is another remark I should like to make: I desire that Churchmen should remember that Christian books ought to maintain the spirit of the Book of Common Prayer. Let us be loyal to the Book of Common Prayer. I am sure there never was a time when we needed more this caution. Let our little prayer-books, and priest's prayer-books, and all other books, be kept in the line of the Book of Common Prayer, and we shall never go far astray. There is no room for seven sacraments; there is no room for anything like the mass; there is no room for anything like a system of auricular confession; there is no room for Mariolatry in the Prayer Book of the Church of England. One word more—let us not one of us read religious books to the neglect of Holy Scripture; let us read them and use them, for many of them will help us on our way; but when we have read them let us ever go back with fresh zest to the Word of God. I love when I have read some Christian book to be able to go back to the Acts of the Apostles, to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle to the Ephesians, and feel that one helps me to understand the other, and both lie exactly in the same line.

The Rev. Richard Randall.

I take up with deep thankfulness one of the valuable thoughts which have fallen from the last speaker. There are just two things with reference to devotional books which I desire to place before the members of the Congress: first, that no greater gift could be

bestowed by any writer upon the members of the Church than the putting into our hands a volume of devout meditations upon the New Testament from its beginning to its close. I am sure that all our hearts must have gone with those who have spoken about the need of the soul pouring itself forth, and expressing for itself its own wants and its own desires when it is brought face to face with God. And we must also have fully sympathised with what was said by another speaker, that at the moment of prayer no one can so guide the soul as God Himself, and that the best of all guides to devotion is His own Holy Word. Any one, therefore, who would produce a well-composed book of Meditations and Prayers on the New Testament, would marvellously enrich the children of the Church. Then next in the very good list given us by Mr Goe of the subjects which should be contained in a book of devotion, there seems to be one thing left out which I miss in so many of our books of Prayers. I mean that there is a lack of such devotions as shall place the soul in an attitude of adoration before Almighty God. Prayer we have, and forms of penitence ; but I remember learning from the lips of that Bishop, whom I venerated and loved as deeply as the Dean of Chester can, the great Bishop Wilberforce, in the very passage referred to by the Dean, that there is no moment when the soul is so ready to be acted upon by God as in the moment when it presents itself before Him in prayer ; that then it is like wax, ready to receive an impression which may perhaps mark and stamp it for ever. Therefore, at that moment there should be brought before the soul the greatness of God, the purity of God, the tenderness of God, the love of God, the compassion of God ; all which concerns the character of God in Himself ; all which concerns the character of God in His dealings with the soul. It is most important that forms of adoration, praise or thanksgiving, should be more largely supplied than they have been hitherto in most of our Manuals of Devotion. Of old it was said by one who was a great guide of the souls of men to God, "If you would be a true penitent, first look God in the face, and then come with the story of your own griefs, and ask your Heavenly Father to remove from your spirit the cloud of sin which has come between you and Him." These two simple things may perhaps be of some use to those of us who may have regretted the almost necessity of occupying the time given to this meeting in saying the strong words of warning which have fallen from the representatives of those who value truth, and have felt it to be their bounden duty to endeavour to guard their brother Churchmen against errors which they think are to be found in some of the existing books of devotion. I am sure that we must have regretted to a man that there should have been even any appearance of a necessity for the speaking of such words.

Before closing the session, the Right Rev. the President said, "A special prayer has been drawn up asking for God's blessing upon the approaching visit of the Prince of Wales to India, and it is proposed that it should be used at the opening service in the evening. It is also intended that a copy of it should be at once sent to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and another copy to her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, both to be signed by me on behalf of the Congress."*

The President pronounced the benediction, and the meeting closed.

---

* The receipt of the prayer was acknowledged by Sir W. Knollys on behalf of the Prince of Wales in the following letter :—

"Marlborough House, Pall Mall, S.W.,
Monday, October 11, 1875.

"Sir William Knollys presents his compliments to the Bishop of Lichfield, and in compliance with his request, did not fail to lay before their Royal Highnesses, the Prince and Princess of Wales, the prayer he enclosed on behalf of the Prince of Wales on the occasion of his departure for India. Their Royal Highnesses have directed Sir W. Knollys to convey to the Bishop of Lichfield their warm thanks for the kind interest he has evinced for the health and safety of the Prince during his journey in the East.

"The Right Rev. the Bishop of Lichfield."

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, 8th OCTOBER.

Mr Campbell, M.P., took the Chair at half-past Two.

PASTORAL WORK.

PAPERS.

The Venerable Archdeacon Blunt.

I feel considerable diffidence in attempting to interest a Church Congress in a subject so familiar, so unsentimental, and so unattractive, as District Visiting and Bible Classes. Other subjects, especially in an age of sensationalism, have a tendency to overshadow the more quiet and unobtrusive work of the pastor in visiting from house to house, and in his little gatherings for Scripture study and Scripture exposition; and yet in that kingdom "which cometh not with observation," even this work may be not the least important, and much of the real strength of the Church may lie in the unpretending labours of humble men, working with an unostentatious zeal scarcely known beyond the narrow horizon of their own parishes.

I speak, then, of pastoral work; and I would urge the importance of progress in this department of the Church's agency, if we are to maintain the proportion of duty in good works, as well as the proportion of faith.

With an increase in the number of clergy, of churches, and of services, there ought to be increased efficiency in pastoral work. It should be, and I believe it is, the especial glory of our Church that the vow of its ministers should be as honestly fulfilled as it has been wisely imposed, "to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish," and "to use not only public but private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, as need shall require, and occasion shall be given."

But in considering this subject, I am compelled to limit my remarks to the range of my own experience, without borrowing from the theories of others; and as one who has only worked in large parishes in London and elsewhere, I must pass by pastoral visiting in country parishes, and speak exclusively in this paper of town work.

The prospect of a clergyman as he casts his eyes over his town parish with 5, 10, 15 or 20,000 parishioners, is enough to fill him with despair. He envies his country brother his opportunity of personal knowledge of every parishioner; he yearns after that relationship in which he might become friend, brother, pastor, to every family in the parish; and wonders

how he can even hope to be to his thousands more than a mere official. Now he must make up his mind to what he can do and what he cannot do; must resolve on a carefully considered system; must be willing on every ground to enrol, train, and direct as large a body of efficient lay helpers as he can find.

I say on every ground; not on that of saving himself trouble, for I believe the more efficient the lay helpers, the more work will be found for the pastor; nor on the ground of necessity alone, but for the good alike of himself, of his helpers, and of his parishioners.

First, then, District Visitors, women and men also, if they can be found; lay readers, mission women, any, or all of these, he will resolve to employ. I know there are some who refuse District Visitors—many who only tolerate them. I believe—and I have for years had nearly one hundred districts visited by them—that they are, for the most part, what their pastor makes them; that they very much reflect his own interest and enthusiasm; that if he and they are truly united in the sacred fellowship of work and worship, the value of their help is incalculable.

We may lament that they are not a part of the Church's system, and may hope for better times, when their agency shall be officially recognised; but until other and more pressing claims have been satisfied for the recognition, not by individual bishops, but by the Church itself, of lay readers, and the revival of the sub-diaconate, or of a perpetual diaconate, we must be content to work with such materials as we have, and with or without authoritative sanction, to make them as efficient as possible.

District Visitors need to be carefully selected, diligently trained, and wisely directed.

Let me say a word on each of these points.

First. Careful selection. None but regular communicants should be chosen; in every case there should be a private interview with the visitor; her duties should be explained to her. Alas! that it is inconsistent with our facts, though not with our theories, to speak of a district visitor as she and her, not as he and him! "Hints to District Visitors," such as those by Dr F. Hessey, or by the late Bishop Wilberforce, together with the rules of the particular parish organisation, should be given to her. Her work should be begun with prayer, either offered privately by the clergyman at that interview, or publicly at the next meeting of district visitors. This is of vital importance. Besides the direct blessing from prayer, there is the indirect testimony that both the work itself and the self-devotion it demands are an offering to God, not an act of personal kindness to the clergyman, together with the inference that it may be very sinful to relinquish such a work, unless it is the will of the Master who was pleased to accept it.

Second. The training of district visitors is too much neglected.

Having appointed each to the sort of district fitted for each, small or large, ten houses or fifty, degraded or respectable, it is the clergyman's duty to try to train the district visitor for her work. For this purpose short lectures may be given from time to time, and even repeated at intervals of a few years. This will give substantial assistance to those entering on the work; will gently, because indirectly, correct the mistakes of even the most experienced; will impart fresh stimulus to all, and will revive the flagging interest of the careless or the disheartened. Eight or

ten lectures of a quarter of an hour each may cover the whole ground. May I suggest the following heads?

1. The district visitor in her threefold relation to the Church, the poor, and herself.

2. In her office—not a spy, or judge, or intruder, or reprover, or lady patroness, but a Christian sister with something to learn, as well as much to teach, and with a call from God to comfort, counsel, elevate, sympathise with, and gladden the poor.

3. Character of her work. Importance of regularity, earnestness, self-devotion, perseverance, and what its motive must be.

4. Things to be avoided. Gossipping, idle talking, inquisitiveness, censoriousness, impertinence.

5. Topics of conversation. The work of the poor—the duty of providence by means of penny banks, clothing clubs, &c. The children of the poor—kindly suggestions about their baptism, their education, their home-training.

6. Above all, the higher life of those she visits—private and family prayer—attendance at church and at the Lord's Supper.

7. Almsgiving—its danger—principles which should guide those who give relief.

8. Sick visiting. Simple rules about health, cleanliness, ventilation, preservation from infection.

9. Things to be avoided in a sick room. Talking too long—talking too loud—exciting the sick—confusing them with too many subjects—and necessity of quiet cheerfulness and sympathy.

10. How best to deliver Christ's message to them. Explanation of the Visitation Service, and of passages of Scripture bearing on sickness, and so forth.

Third. But in addition to this training, district visitors need that constant direction which can only be effectual when the intercourse between them and the clergyman is free, friendly, and cordial. It is fatal to the harmony of their common work, if there is an impression that the clergyman is too busy, or too impatient, or too indifferent to listen to their communications. Once let the tie between them be weakened, or the channel of communication be interrupted at any point, and symptoms will appear of general paralysis in the whole system. Possibly clergy and visitors may still do a separate work, good in itself, but it will scarcely be the work of the Church in the Church's way.

Above all, there should be monthly meetings for business, begun with prayer, and quarterly or yearly gatherings for public worship, with a sermon on some feature of Christian work, followed by Holy Communion. This will encourage the disheartened, revive the waning zeal of the weary, rub down the little unevennesses which may from time to time arise, and keep alive the sense of fellowship. Indeed, without this service in God's house, the sacredness of their mutual relation, as well as of the work in which they engage, may soon be lost sight of altogether, and the only strength whereby it can be carried on may slowly dwindle away.

But I must venture to say a few words about the work of the town clergyman in his own visiting, although with the recollection that I am addressing many much more capable of speaking on so delicate a subject. He should aim at two things—the regular visitation of the sick and

of those to whom the visitors have called his attention, and the gradual house-to-house visitation of his whole parish. This last duty is one which is, I fear, frequently omitted in our large parishes by reason of its apparent impossibility. But it may be done, if the clergyman always himself introduces a new district visitor to each house in her district, and arranges to accompany each one in turn through her district. By such means as this the clergyman will in time have entered every house in the parish, and will perhaps some day find himself welcomed at the sick bed, not quite as a stranger, but as a friend who made (it may be years before) a visit which has not been forgotten. But there is a further advantage in the attempt to fulfil this vow of our ordination:

The true Home Mission work of the Church is in this way best carried forward—this is the going into the "highways and hedges to compel them to come in." The public services of the Church almost exclusively tend to the building up of Christ's people, but this promotes the work of converting; this is "to seek Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." And from this point of view, it is a work which by a clergyman of the National Church should be attempted in every section of his parishioners—upper, middle, and lower classes—amongst Churchmen, Dissenters, and even Roman Catholics. It is a fact which we scarcely recognise as remarkable, because we are so familiar with it, that as a rule, amongst all classes the clergyman of the parish is a welcome visitor. It might be far otherwise, and that it is not so should be not merely a cause of thankfulness, but also a suggestion of the grave responsibility attaching to us if we fail to use it aright.

Few now-a-days assert that they would rather not know their pastor out of the pulpit, lest they should be shocked by the divergence between his precept and his example. Light or no light, a bushel will not hide his true character; and the inconsistent life of a clergyman, a life of idleness, worldliness, frivolity, luxury, pleasure-seeking, money-loving, *will* be known, however shy of each other priest and people may be. But in visiting of this kind, how difficult to avoid on the one hand the mere complimentary morning call, and on the other that unseemliness which, regardless of all delicacy and tact, drags in conversation on sacred things, and leaves behind the flavour either of a sanctimonious hypocrisy, or of a mere piece of professional gossip! It is in this intercourse so especially true that there is a sense in which Christian and gentleman are synonymous terms. Christ's message may be delivered in Christ's name, and yet perhaps that name may not escape the lips. The conversation of the Christian pastor will not only avoid gossip and slander, but all foolish talking and idle words. There will be something elevating and ennobling about the whole tone and manner of one who lives with Christ and comes from Christ; there will be no self-consciousness or affectation; he will instinctively talk about all things in a religious spirit, rather than force religious topics; he will expect God's guidance in the private visit, as well as in the public exhortation; will naturally use every opportunity of speaking a word in season, and the impression left behind will be an influence indirect but real, which testifies that even that pastoral visit was a "labour in the Lord." But the visiting of the sick and suffering, the aged and the infirm, the bereaved, the dying, will require even more

faith and wisdom and love. Perhaps no work upon earth is more interesting, certainly none of more paramount importance; so that its omission from any cause will inflict a loss, not only on those he neglects, but on the clergyman himself, who will be truant from the best school in which to learn how to preach and how to practise. It is impossible to give any suggestions on so wide a subject. I would only say it seems to me that two things are essential to efficient sick-visiting—to be in sympathy with Christ and in sympathy with our brethren, to realise our sonship to God and our brotherhood with man, and to be vividly conscious of both whenever we visit. Many good men, on the one hand, fail to interest, win, and comfort the sick whom they visit, because they have starved or extinguished their true human instincts; and so, although they speak wise and good words, they fail to touch that mysterious chord of sympathy which vibrates within the sufferer's heart. And many good men, on the other hand, are overflowing with compassion and kindness, sensitively alive to every emotion of the sufferer, who is conscious of their being *en rapport* with him; but because their ear is not open to God's voice, they have no message to deliver from Him; and therefore all they can leave with the sick or dying man, is a dull truism mechanically uttered, or the perfunctory repetition of some truth not felt to be truth at the time. He only is the efficient sick-visitor, be he clergyman or be he layman, who both "loves God and loves his brother also."

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words on Bible classes, which, in the various departments of pastoral work, rank next in importance to pastoral visiting, especially in larger parishes. I will not pause to show how essential in these days is the diligent and thoughtful study of the sacred volume. We have infinitely more to fear from ignorance of the Bible than from any amount of learning. While the faith of one person suffers from an unscrupulous and hostile criticism, that of ten thousand suffers from indifference and neglect. No better prevention against error can be found than in the careful, prayerful, critical study of the Scriptures. No better defence of the Bible can be put forward than the Bible itself. And since the Bible is the most intensely interesting, as well as the most instructive book in the world, Bible classes, conducted by those who give themselves to the patient study of Biblical literature and to earnest prayer for guidance in Divine truth, will be sure to be most attractive as well as most useful.

Now, in all large parishes there should be, I submit, some teaching supplemental to the preaching Sunday by Sunday from stray texts on passages. Our people require more definite instruction. We should arrange for more completeness and coherence in our teaching. If there cannot be, as there should be, a continuous course of expository lectures at one of the Sunday or week-day services, there should be Bible classes, adapted for each section of the parishioners, affording an opportunity for every one to study carefully the Holy Scriptures.

I venture to give a very few hints for some such classes:

1. I pass by the Sunday school with its Bible class for those who have been confirmed, to speak of another that I have found attractive—Bible-readings for children of the middle and upper classes, from about nine years old to the age of confirmation. It is a mistake to suppose they need them much less than the children of the poor, or that their parents

are reluctant to send them. On the contrary, especially if their parents and friends are invited to attend (sitting of course in another part of the room), they will be found most popular. It is good to bring the children under the influence of the clergyman, that they may know each other before they meet in the confirmation class. The clergyman will be better acquainted with their characters and dispositions, and they will be less shy and timid.

This, like every other class, should be opened and concluded by hymns and prayer, perhaps with collects at the beginning, and extempore prayer applying the lessons at the close. Questions may be asked, not merely of the children during the class, but by the children before the class begins. They should be invited to send in written questions on the previous day on the passage to be read; in reading and answering which, the clergyman would not mention the name of the questioner. This greatly increases the interest of the children.

2. Bible classes for young women, apprentices, servants, persons in shops, are happily becoming so common, that nothing remains to be said on this point. A lending library, deposit bank, an association providing for the education of one or more children in one of our missionary schools abroad, a singing-class, an occasional reading of private letters from the mission field, sacred poetry, stories from Church history, &c., may be added with advantage. And opportunities should be given at the close of each class for any who wish to ask the clergyman privately questions on matters connected with the lesson, or with their own lives.

3. But there are others for whom Bible study may be provided, of whom we hear less than we should do. In all large parishes there will be found a certain number of educated persons who can be interested in a course of thoughtful and expository lectures on some portion of the Bible, and who may be persuaded to take notes as students at a professor's lecture. This will help the clergyman to keep up his own studies, will compel him to find time for reading works of the best scholars, and will furnish materials for his sermons. But above all, these lectures will train the more educated and thoughtful members of his congregation in the intellectual as well as the devotional study of Holy Scriptures. At these meetings, as in the children's class, I have found that the most interesting and often most suggestive questions have been sent in by its members on the previous day, and that this method of teaching has tended to cultivate an appreciation of a love for the sacred volume which the listening to sermons had failed to effect.

Finally, all Bible classes, all district visiting, all pastoral work, should find a common meeting point in some union of communicants. This will best give cohesion and fellowship to all Church workers. Into this union the newly confirmed may each year be introduced, and in it they may find the best training to fit them for Church work. Speaking for myself, I prefer to have as few rules as possible, and nothing in the shape of pledges or vows; but rather to draw up one or two prayers to be offered before receiving the Holy Communion, together with some few suggestions as to the best mode of carrying out the objects of the union, which may commend themselves to the hearts and consciences of its members. At stated periods the members should gather for a devotional meeting—at one time of the year there may be a social tea, at another an anniversary

service and Holy Communion; but at all times and in all places, by all that receive their card of membership, and use the prayers written upon it before partaking of the Holy Communion, there will be found in such a union a token of brotherly love, which will consecrate much of the intercourse of social life; a bond of fellowship which, centred in Christ, is sacred, and shall be eternal; a protest that its members are "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;" a pledge that they who worship in the same church and work in the same parish, are "drawing nearer, day by day, each to his brethren, all to God."

The Rev. Prebendary Cadman, Rector of Holy Trinity, Marylebone.

Pastoral work, or the work of a pastor, speaks its meaning in its name. It is to feed the flock, to guard against any sheep or lamb straying from the fold; for this purpose to mend the enclosures, to search for the lost, reclaim the straying, heal the diseased, protect the fold.

In a Christian application it needs to be a work of love, of faith, of patience. It calls for accuracy of knowledge as to members of the flock, as to the circumstances of their position, as to the peculiarities of the fold. It requires on the part of the pastor constant thought, unceasing watchfulness, untiring care. The question arises, how and by what means this work can be efficiently done, in what way obedience can be practically manifested to the Divine command, "Be thou diligent to know the state of thy flock, and look well to thy herds"?

Evidently the public ministry is not sufficient for this purpose. It needs to be supplemented by pastoral watchfulness. The Church requires this of all her ministers. Her deacons are to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of their parish, to ascertain their estate, name, and place where they dwell. Her priests promise to be ready with all faithful diligence to use private as well as public monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole within their cures, as need shall require and occasion be given.

This principle of pastoral work, then, we all acknowledge. The details of it are matters of experience, and must vary according to the varying circumstances of parishes and individuals. Such books as Burnet's "Pastoral Care," Bridges' "Christian Ministry," and biographies of good and successful ministers of Christ, furnish hints and experiences which are of great value. I am glad to mention here the *Clergyman's Magazine*, by members of the "Church Homiletical Society." A paper in the current number on Practical Hints on Pastoral Visitation, well deserves and will richly repay attentive perusal.

But I recollect that I am addressing Christian laity as well as clergy. It is impossible to overrate the importance of the help which increasing numbers of Christian men and women cheerfully give, in schools for children and for adults by day and by night, in Bible classes, in cottage readings, in every department of work, both in the Church and out of it,

in which their help can be available. May it go on increasing in efficiency and spirituality, and be as thankfully accepted as it is generously tendered. It is not to the clergy only that the direction was given, "As every one hath received the gift, so minister the same."

One word of explanation here. Met as Churchmen, we speak of pastoral work as to our own experience of it, but by so doing we do not ignore the fact that there are other workers beside ourselves. They may not follow with us, but no true Churchman would wish to forbid any one, who in the name of Christ is seeking to destroy the evils of ignorance and vice, and contempt of God's Word and commandment. These are the evils against which we too contend, and they that are not against us are on our part. God forbid that jealousies, and suspicions, and contentions about words and titles and things, that have no profit in view of eternity, should distract the attention of shepherds and their helpers when the wolf is at the fold!

The work of which I speak can only be rightly appreciated when it is viewed with reference to eternity, the value and the danger of the soul, the redeeming love of our Lord, and the account we must all give to Him. But here the old true saying comes rushing on the mind—"Like people, like priest." If one who should be the first and foremost in devising or carrying out, or countenancing Christian work be not himself a man of God—and by the expression I mean one who like Elijah stands in His presence, and therefore fears not the face of man, or like Enoch walks with God, and so can bring testimony to bear upon the ungodly words and deeds of the generation with whom he has to do, or like Paul whose heart's desire and prayer to God for every blind and rejected Israelite was that they might be saved, or like Antipas, Christ's faithful witness, whose praise was with his Master, though his name fills no large place in the Church's annals—if, I say, he be not in this sense a man of God, some part of his work will be neglected; and by not approving himself in all things as a minister of Christ, he cannot but be exercising an injurious influence upon others. A fearful thing it is for the Master's message to reach one who can give no answer to the question, "Where is thy flock, thy beautiful flock?"

Of what consequence then it is for Christian laity to help a Christian minister to keep in mind the one great object which he should ever keep in view. Many an Archippus needs to be told, "Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received that thou fulfil it." And if experienced Christians like Aquila and Priscilla were with humility and discretion to deal with those whose ministry they attend, many a young Apollos might learn the way of God more perfectly, and become afterwards a more efficient labourer in the cause of Christ. I speak this with all the earnestness of conviction that a Christian minister's work is not all done in the church, and that the Christian laity have a right to expect that he should be one whose life preaches wherever he goes, and whose conversation and conduct should cause him to be known and read of all men, as one whose business it is to win souls for Christ. Miserably low would be their standard, if they were to expect a Christian pastor to speak only of his Master from the pulpit or in the church. Miserably mistaken the view of his office if they were to suppose pastoral work could be done by simply mixing in ordinary society, or joining in ordinary amusements, having

all the while the feeling that to make the least allusion to the heavenly Master would be out of place. It needs to be thought of by ministers and people alike, that pastoral work has for its object, I repeat it, the winning of souls to Christ, and therefore the promotion of their holiness, usefulness, and preparation for heaven. Personal acquaintance with the Saviour, and continued communion with Him, will give strength and boldness to go forth and speak and act for Him. Not indeed by assuming priestly authority, or manifesting unwise zeal, but by watching every opportunity to speak what may be truly a word in season.

My object in this part of my paper will be gained, if the thought remain that everywhere, and in all things we should act, and be expected to act publicly and privately, as those whose bounden duty it is never to cease their labour, care, and diligence, while there is any place left among us either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life.

How, then, may we hope to reach or approach this exalted standard, in matters of detail.

The means indicated in the title are Visiting, Cottage Lectures, and Bible-Classes. With reference to the first, it is obvious that what is wanted is to get accurate acquaintance with individual members or separate sections of our flock. In small parishes this is easy, and in larger it can only be by well organised and numerous workers, and by encouraging communications in every possible way. Some, with this object in view, and with praiseworthy zeal, have sought to establish "after-meetings" for prayer and counsel; some have spoken favourably of what is known as an "inquiry-room," others have been contented with encouraging private interviews with the anxious, and seizing opportunities which occur in God's providence when a pastoral visit must be acceptable, and others have looked anxiously and desired fervently the influence of what is known elsewhere as the confessional. Of these various means I say nothing, further than that a long experience has led me to these conclusions:—

The first,—one in which, I believe, I am borne out by the judgment of the majority of English Christians, viz., that the confessional is foreign to the spirit of our reformed Church; that it is not good either for priest or people; that it necessitates a distinction between mortal and venial sin—for the reality of which distinction there is no Scripture authority; that in order to discover what mortal sin really is, questions have to be asked that bring sin rather than Christ before the penitent's mind; that the very exceptional cases to which our Prayer-Book is supposed to refer do not show its general necessity, nor justify its adoption, and that when enforced or resorted to, it gendereth a bondage which our forefathers could not bear, and which, if attempted to be again enforced, will assuredly rend asunder the framework of the Church of England.

The second,—that communications with the people for their spiritual good are beneficial to the clergyman as much as to the people. Many a lesson of instruction does he learn, many an example does he see of the power of the Word of God to soothe, enlighten, refresh, and comfort. Many a living instance does he discover of personal consecration to God, and of cheerful, humble piety, and of self-denying ministries of Christian love which show that a religious life may be combined with secular duties. It is said that bees will not seek to extract honey from flowers that are bedded together; but, however this may be, I am sure that the honey

of Christian piety and influence is to be found most frequently where the fragrance of a holy life and communion with God is shed over the hallowing and sometimes pressing cares of relative duties.

A system of what for want of a better name has been called Cottage Lectures has been found very useful in the further carrying out of parochial work. The plan is this : One of those invaluable agents, whose cheerful piety recommends their work, selects a room, and induces its owner to invite neighbours and friends. Some ten or twelve assemble ; the clergyman comes at an appointed hour, and after prayer, reads and expounds some portion of Holy Scripture, and again prays with them, the whole service occcupying not more than fifteen or twenty minutes, after which there is an opportunity of personal converse, and of such kind inquiries on the part of the clergyman as win for him a Church-going people. Two or three such meetings may be held in the same afternoon in different parts of the parish. The advantages are many. Some will remain to talk of some difficulty, to ask advice, to request some explanation, to mention some cases of sickness or distress ; or to suggest where a clergyman's visit might be found useful or acceptable. Barriers are thus broken down which create strangeness and enstrangement. Prejudices are softened and removed. The clergyman is esteemed as a friend and father. Pastoral work is done with a great economy of time and labour, and pastoral ties are formed which cannot be easily broken. This plan has the further advantage that with modifications it is equally applicable to the drawing-room, the servants' hall, and the dwellings of the poor.

But this brings us to the consideration of Bible Classes. These will be treated of, I believe, by a following speaker ; and on them, therefore, I have only a brief word or two to offer. They afford opportunities for carrying out the scriptural precept " line upon line," and of entering into explanations of difficulties and removal of objections which the ordinary ministry of the Word does not touch.

Every one engaged in pastoral work finds out that the prevailing ignorance of Holy Scripture, even amongst those well-informed on other subjects, is lamentably great. It is the solemn duty of Christian pastors to remove it. What a large opening for usefulness is presented by Bible-classes I hardly need say, for children, for young men, for candidates before and after confirmation, for workmen, for Sabbath-school teachers, for pupil teachers, and which may be undertaken, some, if not all, as occasion offers, in the church, in the school-room, or at the parsonage, with every assurance of success. Say not that the labour will be too great. It is pastoral work, and a pastor should work. " Blessed are they that sow beside all waters." Say not that attention to these will hinder other parts of ministerial work. One work will prepare and strengthen for another, and be the means of making the man of God himself well instructed and furnished for every good word and work. If, for example, his mind be impressed by the special services of the day—the Prayers, the Psalms, and Lessons—he has from this source alone a grand repository of thought, and a great advantage in the certainty of leaving out nothing that is profitable, and of not shunning to declare to those to whom he ministers, the whole counsel of God.

A great and glorious future, I believe, in the short time that probably remains before the advent of our Lord, is before our Church, if only grace be

given to her ministers, and her children generally, to hold fast to His truth, and diligently to do the work to which He calls us at home and abroad. But there are serious thoughts pressing for consideration, because of our present difficulties and our past sins. Our works are not found perfect before God. One anxiously inquires, Will our reformed Church continue a faithful witness for Christ? Will her ministers be faithful stewards and watchmen? Will Churchmen remember how they have received, and hold fast, and repent? Will they go on contending with each other while the enemy is coming in like a flood? It is said that some of our parishes are becoming like the garden of the slothful, and that others are entangling themselves again with the yoke of bondage? Shall this continue?

I know not what may be in store for us, but I have read, and believe it, that judgment begins at the house of God, and that when in righteous displeasure He visits a nation for its sins, "'tis in the Church the leprosy begins."

I know not what may be in store for us, but I am conscious that deep responsibility rests upon the present generation of the Church's children. There is such a thing as apostasy; there is such a thing as turning back in the day of battle; there is such a thing as deserting our standard and going over to the foe; there is such a thing as contending with each other instead of doing the work to which the Master calls us. Would that there might be a true Pentecostal baptism given, and that it would please God that the Holy Spirit might in larger measure be poured forth. His loving grace would do everything needed for our separate parishes, and for the Church at large. But surely I am not wrong in thinking that the manifestation of His presence would be quickly seen in the earnestness, the spirituality, the diligence, the faithfulness, the loving spirit of the ministers of Christ, and in the diligent discharge of their pastoral work. Pastoral work neglected means an unfaithful ministry—an unfaithful ministry means a divided household; a divided household is neither doing the Master's work nor watching for His appearing. Who then but can join, and that with solemn uplifting of heart to God, in the words of Bishop Ken, with which I conclude—

> "Give me the priest these graces shall possess—
> Of an ambassador, the first address;
> A father's tenderness, a shepherd's care,
> A leader's courage, which the Cross can bear;
> A ruler's awe, a watchman's wakeful eye,
> A pilot's skill, the helm in storms to ply;
> A fisher's patience, and a labourer's toil,
> A guide's dexterity to disembroil;
> A prophet's inspiration from above,
> A teacher's knowledge, and a Saviour's love."

Rev. E. T. Leeke, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Cambridge.

I intend to speak in this paper more of practice than of theory, and I do not aim at talking of grand schemes which are out of the reach of myself and many others, but of simple plans, which I have seen carried out in ordinary town or country parishes, in a very quiet and regular and unobtrusive way.

I need not speak of the love of our Father, which ought to be the moving-power in all work for Him. They who work best for Him know best that, without this love, the world would be very dark and our lives very hopeless, and what is now the brightest and most hopeful service of love would be mere drudgery.

You will not charge me with presumption, if sometimes what I write falls into the form of suggestions or hints. I am quite aware that such suggestions as this paper contains are of the commonest and most every-day kind, and that my own experience is too small to warrant me in supposing that they will be very useful. But we have been several times reminded, in the course of this Congress, that we meet here to learn from one another, and I hope that the crudities and mistakes in my paper will draw out useful information for others as well as for myself.

I propose presently to speak of Cottage Lectures and of Bible-classes, and of each of these in as practical a way as possible.

This paper is meant to be practical in this respect, first of all, that I do not want to forget the differences between country parishes and large town parishes.

But surely it is a mistake to suppose that workers in the country parishes have nothing to learn from town work, and *vice versa*. As a clergyman in charge of a town parish, I always seem to learn more as to methods of work from a visit to a country parish than in any other way; and I believe that an acquaintance with the organization as to Bible-classes, &c., which is possible in a large town parish, is often of the greatest service to country clergymen.

There is one special point in which I am sure we town clergy may be greatly helped by those whose work lies in the country. We are in danger (in the distractions of a busy life, and in face of the vast populations by which we are some of us surrounded) of neglecting the care of individual members of our flock, and of getting so absorbed in the easier parts of our work as to keep putting off the more awkward and difficult, perhaps neglecting to warn the prominent member of our congregation who is living in open sin, or to become acquainted with some of the artisans and well-to-do parishioners who do not attend any place of worship. Now there is nothing more helpful to us in such matters than the quiet and earnest life of many a country parson—the grief over the single sheep that has strayed from the fold—the oft-repeated effort to bring it back.

Again, we know, each of us, that men have their special gifts. All are not good teachers, for instance, though I do think that many young clergymen may well remember that it is not always the least clever man who is the worst teacher; many a man who cannot lay claim to much

intellectual power, may, by care and practice, become a clear and attractive teacher.

The happiest and the best way is to aim at doing well what seems most within the range of one's powers. If more of us could make up our minds that we cannot do everything; that we can do very few things (perhaps hardly anything) really well; that we cannot hope to solve *all* the riddles of life; then, I think, we should, with more earnest purpose, and with more hope of success, set ourselves to the work for which God in His providence seems to have most fitted us, and to which He is leading us.

I know so well what it is to suffer from distracted aims, to want to do all sorts of things, to touch questions for which one is unsuited by training and habit, that I have ventured thus to suggest that we should most of us do well to confine ourselves more to one groove of work.

Then with regard to Cottage Lectures.

There is a place for them in almost every parish, though they are, like all other agencies of the kind, liable to abuse. They are not for all. It would not be an ideal parish, in my opinion, in which a series of cottage lectures was so arranged throughout the parish that all could attend at regular intervals, and which all were invited to attend.

They are not to take the place of public worship, least of all of the Holy Communion. I mention this, because I have myself seen the danger of persons getting to look upon the cottage lecture as what they would call their "means."

It is, of course, best for the clergyman himself to take the cottage lecture; yet if he be prevented from doing so, a lay reader appointed by the bishop, or the Scripture reader, or some other laymen, may well take it. It will, however, in the long run, be found more successful in interest and numbers, and a far greater help to the spiritual life of those who attend it, if it can be taken by one of the clergy.

Now, in a country parish, it will be taken almost certainly by the clergyman, and it will be held in some hamlet, for the aged and infirm and mothers with young children. One and another will in turn lend their room, and take a pride in gathering together a large party for the lecture. As regards the careless and badly-disposed men and women, it will generally be found easier to get them to church by continual personal appeals than to such a meeting.

In a town parish the clergyman will often have his time so fully occupied in the evening as not to be able to take such lectures himself. In that case he will, as I said before, get his lay-helpers to undertake the work, taking part in it himself when possible.

Now, in the town parish there may be, I think, two distinct classes of cottage lecture:—

1. For such as would wish to attend public worship, but are debarred from doing so by infirmity or age. For this lecture I would recommend, where possible, a fixed room in any outlying part of the parish, for the use of which a small sum to cover expenses of fire and light should probably be paid, and in which a definite short service, consisting of selections from our Morning and Evening Prayers (such an one as Archdeacon Blunt has kindly given me, and which he has had printed in large type on a card) should be used. There should be a few well-known hymns to select

from, and a very simple address, which might from time to time take the form of instruction concerning the Holy Communion.

2. For such persons as are more or less careless, and are deterred by idleness, or want of smart clothes, from coming to church. For this I would recommend that different houses should, where possible, be chosen, week by week, and that the lay-helpers should go round during the preceding week to give notice of it, and (especially) renew their visit to some of the most careless an hour or so before the time of meeting.

Though, I suppose, we have most of us seen cases where these cottage lectures seem to have done but little good, or only to have gathered the people together, to stir them up a little, with the result that, if they afterwards went anywhere, it would be to a Dissenting Chapel, yet I am quite sure that they may (if rightly conducted, distinctly as a Church agency, and not forgetting to aim at the presence of the people at church, and eventually at the Holy Communion) prove of the greatest benefit. They are one way in which the Church may go out to seek those who are unable or unwilling to come to her.

In Cambridge (where we have in term-time no lack of earnest men willing to do something, if the way is pointed out to them) I have often felt the need of pressing the importance of not making the cottage lecture a substitute for the public worship of the Church.

And now may I make one suggestion both for town and country parishes. If the shortened form of Evening Prayer (with one lesson) be used daily in the church at a suitable hour—say seven o'clock, and a short practical exposition be added either at the close of the service, or immediately after the Lesson, it will, I think, be found to fill the place (and more than fill it) of a cottage lecture for the people who live close at hand. Only, care should be taken to have a bright and hearty service. Such a service, with two hymns, we have in a small church in my own parish, and our people really like and profit by it. It lasts, in all, not more than forty minutes. I do believe in trying to lead our people, step by step, to the intelligent use of the services of our Church.

And now, in regard to Bible-classes.

I daresay I may travel outside the limits which the term was intended to include, but you will excuse my doing so.

Teaching is a grand thing—very much neglected (sometimes) in sermons and cottage lectures and even in Bible-classes. Children, and young people and old people, get a great deal more of exhortation and stirring up, in some parishes, than of teaching. Now it seems to me that without teaching there is nothing to stir up. What a much more stable foundation would our people have for their faith, how much less easily would they be blown over by the breath of unbelief, how much more deep would flow the stream of their religious life, how much less liable to be diverted by fanaticism or doubt, if they were but taught the story of the love of God in Jesus Christ, if that wonderful purpose of redemption, so wonderfully worked out in the incarnation, the life and death, the resurrection and ascension of our Lord, and in the coming of the Holy Ghost, were more clear in their minds! This wonderful story, and the equally wonderful work of the Lord Jesus in His Church these more than 1800 years, I would teach to young and old, in church and in the cottage lecture and in the Bible-class, believing that, more than all other

exhortations or teachings, this simple story has, by God's grace, the power to draw us to Him who is our Life.

People are very fond of being taught; they will always listen if there is anything to learn, only it must be put in such a way that they *can* learn. Then, I think, Bible-classes are a wonderful power in a parish.

It is not well to try to have a few large classes, but rather a number of small ones, as a general rule. Arrange your classes, whether on Sundays or other days, so that persons of various social grades (or, as I would rather put it, parties of friends) may have the opportunity of having a class pretty much to themselves. In this way your classes may be small at first, but they will be more coherent, and will gradually draw in a larger number than if your classes were less numerous. Do not go on a cut-and-dried plan, but as you find a set of boys or girls, for instance, might be got into a class, do not be afraid to arrange a special one for them, if you think they will not nicely fit in with your existing classes. There will, of course, be Bible-classes in connection with your Sunday-schools, one or more, as the case may be. Are there some rough lads who have left school before they were old enough for the Bible-class? Get hold of a sensible teacher, and let him collect them for a class in his own house or in some other room away from the school. These boys have slipped through the meshes of your regular net; you must fish for them specially.

Or are there a lot of rough men loafing about in the early afternoon, just when the public-houses are closed? They seem rather hopeless, but an open door near at hand, and a pleasant invitation renewed every Sunday, and a few bright hymns and straightforward words about the love of God and the misery of sin, will not be in vain, and will, surely, rejoice the heart of Him who says, "I will seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day."

And should not servant-girls, especially in towns, have classes arranged for them before afternoon service, so that they may get to church as well as to their class? It seems to me that there is no set of persons to whom such a class is more likely to be useful.

Or are there some girls who are of a higher social scale than the mass of the children in your school? You will get some lady to collect them in a class of their own, and she will become their friend and leader, and they will form a band of pure-hearted girls which will exercise an influence for good upon all the young people of the parish.

In a country parish it will be found sometimes, that young men and lads will come on a Sunday evening before church to a class. I know such a class, which has been carried on most successfully for some years, and which now numbers many married men amongst its members.

I have so often heard people say they cannot succeed in plans such as these. I believe that the great thing is to be contented with a small beginning, and to be content to work on patiently and regularly, and the success will come at last.

There is one other, perhaps less common, plan which is of the greatest use. After evening service on Sunday, during the winter months, we have a short teaching or instruction, lasting about fifteen minutes, for such as like to remain. At this some portion of the Bible may be taken, some biography, or the history of the early Church, and of the Church of England.

Or the scheme of our Morning and Evening Prayer may be explained, or one of the occasional offices gone through. Or some slight sketch of the history of the Creed may be given. We have found for a long time that this is very popular with our people, a large number of them remaining to the "instruction." I suppose that, almost in every case, the clergy will be unable to take charge of these Sunday classes themselves. But on the other days of the week, I must think the time would be well bestowed which they might spend on classes of various kinds.

I may mention, as possible and useful—(1) A class of working men on Saturday evenings, at which questions and discussion should be encouraged. (2) A class for lads and young men who have been confirmed, probably in connection with the guild or prayer union which has been formed in the parish. This would naturally form a training-school for Sunday-school teachers. (3) A class for preparation of the next Sunday's lessons with the teachers of the Sunday-school. These two last might be fortnightly, and might between them occupy the hour before the short weekly prayer-meeting or office (if there be one) of the guild. (4) An early evening (weekly or fortnightly) class for servants, and a late evening class for young women engaged in shops and workrooms and factories. (5) A fortnightly afternoon class for district visitors and others, as well as one for girls who may probably belong to a higher social class than those who would come to the evening classes.

(6) Last, but not least, I would mention classes for the instruction of the pupil-teachers and monitors. These would, of course, be concerned with the definite subjects appointed for examination by the Diocesan Board of Education. The great difficulty in the way of these classes is the complicated schemes approved in some dioceses. We have adopted a plan in Cambridge which is working successfully, by which the pupil-teachers and monitors of the schools in the different parishes come in groups to a series of classes or lectures adapted for the work of the various years. These are divided amongst several of the clergy by mutual consent, and are proving a useful supplement to the work which each clergyman can find time for with his own pupil-teachers.

In conclusion, I am quite sure that time thus spent in Bible-class teaching is well spent, and that the fruits of it will be seen year by year in the increasing numbers of intelligent worshippers at our churches (especially amongst the young), and of regular and earnest communicants. And further, what catechising ought to effect, and often does effect in our rural parishes or in a small and workable town parish, would be in great part secured by this method—viz., that the allusions and references in sermons which are so often not understood would be within the reach of a much larger number, and so the power of the clergyman in the pulpit be very much increased.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. H. T. Fountaine.

I have worked in an agricultural parish of about 2000 inhabitants; secondly, in a large suburb of a large town with villa residences; and now it has pleased God to place me amongst 7000 colliers and poor people, and I have come to this Congress to gather all the information I can to carry back for the benefit of those people. Yesterday morning in the large hall a speaker said, "Be very careful that you get gentlemen to work." I said to myself, "If I go back and look in that parish for gentlemen, I can find four, and I have to stir them up to take an interest in the work; whereas I can get plenty of willing helpers from amongst working men." Now, who is to be visited? We have heard a great deal about district visitors, but I am rather going to speak about the visiting of the parish priest; and I say, first of all, when you go into a parish, visit everybody, no matter whether they are Dissenters or Churchmen, go to them and offer your services to them. God has placed you there as a parish priest over the whole parish, and I think it is the bounden duty of the parish priest to say he is willing, at all times and under all circumstances, to do all he can to help every single soul that God has placed under his care. Before you go offer a prayer to God for His blessing, and then go with an object. It is so easy to go to a poor man's house and talk about the weather, to find out how many people there are in the household; but it is very hard to make all these things lead up to the object you have in view—the spiritual welfare of the souls in the house. I have visited hundreds of dissenting households, and when I look back through my note-books, I have only one note of this kind, "Mrs B. insulted me." I have been to hundreds of dissenting households, and in only one instance out of the whole number have I ever had the cold shoulder given to me, or a hearty welcome withheld. When you go, take a note-book and write down the name of the person, the name of the street, and the number of the row. Get to know the names of the children, whether they have all been baptized, whether there are any of age before long to join your confirmation class. This is of inestimable value afterwards, because when anybody comes to your house asking you to visit so-and-so, you have only to turn to your note-book and find all about the family. Secondly, in visiting nominal Christians, always go with a definite object, to rouse them, if you possibly can, out of the sloth and state of negligence in which they are living. And, last of all, in visiting real Christians, still go with a definite object. It is very hard to do that, because people often will not understand the difference between a call and a pastoral visit, and it would be a good thing to make a pastoral call at a different time from when one goes with one's wife to make a social call. When you call by yourself, perhaps it is for confirmation purposes, or to get a school-teacher or some one to come to the Holy Communion; but I would impress upon all my Christian brethren the necessity of going with a definite object. I have adopted the practice of going to church on Sunday night when the bell begins to ring, taking a small note-book with me, and noticing any one who comes into church whom I do not know, getting the name and address, and afterwards calling. By this means I think we might get hold of many people, men and women, who now come occasionally to church, but find everything very cold; or perhaps they wander into some one's seat, and Mrs So-and-so presently comes in looking very black, and shrugging her shoulders. I once got a poor man and his family to go to church, and after they got home another poor man sent in a message, saying, "If you go to church again, don't go into our seat." Well, call upon these people. Depend upon it, it is one of the great sources of Dissenters' strength that when a person is seen within a chapel door some one is sure to come forward and say, "We are very glad to see you here." So in our own Church we greatly want persons to go to strangers and give them a hearty welcome.

With regard to Bible-classes, pardon me if I say anything which hurts any one's feelings. But before one starts a Bible-class, some information should be given upon these questions—What is the Bible? Where did it come from? Who put it together? What are we to expect to find within the leaves of this book, and what are we not to expect to find? What is the relation in which the written Word of God stands to the Church—the living interpreter of that Word? I often think of the time when Convocation will issue the new edition of the Bible, and I enter a cottage and find a poor woman who places it before me and asks, "How is this? A new Bible come?" I often think of the time when the family shall be seated round the table, one having the new and another the old edition, and they discover that the new lacks a verse which the other has, or a different translation, and ask how this is. I say there is in this English nation in which we live the greatest need of some clear teaching as to what the Bible is—what it contains, and what we are not to expect to find within its leaves, and the relation in which it stands to the Church. Let me then take an epistle of St Paul, and tell them that it is a letter written to a Christian body in a certain definite place, who had been instructed orally in all the principles of the Christian religion. Let me tell them that St Paul wrote this letter for a definite purpose to those Christians, and that they are not to expect every doctrine and every truth which they see and which they hear elsewhere.

Rev. Dr Massingham, Vicar of St Paul's, Longport, Burden.

I am very glad to find this question is brought forward here, because I think there is an increasing attention paid by the younger clergy now to additional services, and I am afraid that there is an increasing indisposition for the work of house-to-house visitation. In my own experience I have found that those who have been more recently ordained prefer a large number of services in the church to what I call the hard parochial work of going from house to house visiting; and I hold that a minister who neglects parochial visitation is only half a minister. In a parish like mine, of from 9000 to 10,000 people, there are many persons who never enter a place of worship, and never will, unless we influence them by bringing the gospel to their houses; and I am quite sure, that if we go from house to house, we shall find as much encouragement, if not more, in this department of parochial work as in other duties. The first case God gave me was that of a man who probably never would have come to church. I went to his house in turn, as it were by accident, and this man looked very black at me. I soon found out he was an atheist, and when I told him I came to him to look after him and his soul, "Soul," he said, "how do you know I have a soul?" I asked, "Don't you believe you have one?" "No, I don't." "You don't?" I continued. "Well, now, two doors below you lies a neighbour of yours who has died. What has gone from her but the soul?" He said, "You have never seen it?" "No, not in your way, but I can see you have a soul." "Then," he answered, "you can see a long way through those spectacles of yours." I said, "I daresay I can." "You have never seen your brains, yet you believe you have some; but I can see you have a soul by every movement of your body. Now the deceased woman, your late neighbour, has eyes, but she cannot see; she has ears, but no hearing; a tongue, but no speech. What has gone from her? I call it the soul; what do you say?" "What is it? why, atmospheric air, I suppose." I then said, "My friend, do you believe that? I will put you to the test. I see by your fire a pair of bellows. Bring them with you, and come with me. If all the woman wants is atmospheric air, you can soon supply that. Come, make her alive again, by giving

her atmospheric air, like an eight-day clock, and I will become an infidel." The man began to laugh. I said, "You are laughing at your own foolishness." "Well," he added, "I don't know what it is." "Ah!" I replied, "you now speak sensibly." And to make a long story short, the consequence was, that I got hold of that man, and he said he would not argue from the Bible, but would meet me on other grounds, and we should argue whether there was an end of a man when he died or not? He met me in my study week after week, and in due time became a baptized Christian and a missionary, labouring to spread the truths that once he ridiculed. This is only one instance of very many which show that, if we go out in our Master's work and in His Spirit, God will bless our visits from house to house. Still we must take care that we do not endeavour to do too much ourselves. Thank God, I have twenty-three lady district visitors who do a great deal of work. In fact, I have two whom I call my female curates, and I believe they do more work from house to house than any curate I have had for some time. As to Bible-classes, I think that every parish which has not a Bible-class is incomplete; and we should take care so to open the subjects as to encourage questions. There are a great many questions floating about and continually arising in our parishes, and people want some place where they can meet and bring those questions to their clergymen, and have any doubts in their mind solved at once. I remember one case, when a confirmation was going to be held, and a young man came at the invitation of another to a Bible-class. He said, "I know that it is right to have Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but I cannot see Confirmation in the Bible; can you find it there?" I said, "Certainly;" and I turned immediately to the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 1, 2), and showed him the passage where the "first principles" are laid down, such as repentance, faith, baptism, laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment. I pointed out that the laying on of hands was associated with doctrines which none denied were set forth all through the New Testament as elements and fundamental principles of the gospel. He said, "I have been told that it refers to ordination." I replied, "It cannot refer to *that*—for are ministers the only ones who are baptized and will have the resurrection?" Then I showed him that, in this and other passages of Scripture, we have some authority for Confirmation, and he and others came forward and received the holy rite. I think also we should have a little Church teaching combined with every one of our class meetings; that is to say, I believe I am not only a minister of God's Holy Word, but I am ordained as a minister of the Church of England. We should never forget that we are Churchmen. At the same time, when I hear so much of our Church being the living interpreter of the Bible, I confess I have a great deal more faith in our Bible than in some of its interpreters. I know the Bible will tell nothing but truth, but if I send a man to explain it, I do not know what he may say. I have always more satisfaction in sending a copy of the Holy Scriptures, than in sending some one to explain those Scriptures. As to cottage lectures, I think those in our schoolrooms and houses are vehicles of great importance, and the more we can multiply them, consistently with other claims upon us, the better it will be for our people and for ourselves.

Captain the Honourable Francis Maude, R.N.

As I have been listening to clergymen speaking of their large parishes, I could not help thinking of a larger parish with which I am concerned, that is, the parish of the Thames Church Mission, where we visit every ship that goes out of the port of London. We have between 300,000 and 400,000 British seamen in our mercantile marine, and I will not say how many emigrants there are every year, but there is not one of these ships

going out of or coming into the port of London which we do not visit. The reason I call it a parish is, that when the chaplain was asked where his parish was, he said, "The whole world." Mr Gudsden, our missionary, is licensed by the Bishop of London, and he has district visitors, if I may call them so. They are half a dozen God-fearing men, who go out in boats to visit the departing ships. They visit their own districts, one including the East India Docks, and the other the West India Docks, and so on, down as far as Gravesend. When I first went to sea in a man-of-war, we never had a Sunday service. There was an order from the Admiralty that the Articles of War should be read so many times in the year, and the captain, who at that time was one of the most ungodly men in the navy (though I am thankful to say he died a holy and spiritual-minded man) adopted the plan of reading the Articles of War on Sunday, by way of passing the time; but I am happy to say that much improvement has taken place since then. It has been very delightful to me to hear of the different plans pursued in your parishes. I was a district visitor in a parish thirty-five or forty years ago. The parish itself contained nearly 200,000 persons, of whom 12,000 were in the district of which I took a portion. We had to visit as pioneers, and in nine cases almost out of ten the children, and even many of the adults, we found were unbaptized. Amongst all the means used by your clergymen you have not mentioned the great missionary cause. I know by experience, that where the missionary cause is well pleaded in a parish, there is a reflex action for good upon that parish, the extent of which you can hardly believe until you have proved it. It gives them a zest for their own souls when they are brought to feel concern for the wretched lives of the heathen. The first thing that crossed my mind when I began to speak about our parish as comprising the world was connected with my beloved departed friend, Captain Elliot, of the Navy. He was the first to set the thing going on the Thames, by founding the Sailors' Home, and interesting naval men in general and the world in seafaring men's souls. He and two or three others were induced one winter's night to go down to the East of London to see what was going on. He was told that some of the finest seamen that could possibly be met with had been treated by the crimps and rascals of the East End of London in a most heartless manner, being turned out of doors, when they had not even so much as a shed to put their heads under. They went down at once to the East End, and found poor fellows who were too proud to beg actually starving, as they stood leaning against the sugar-baking houses for the sake of warmth. Captain Elliot and his friends determined not to leave the spot until they had procured straw and hay for beds, and a fire to warm the men, and had prepared some soup for them. They never laid their heads upon their own beds until they had provided for the poor fellows in this distress. We have now in that Sailors' Home rooms for 500 men, and I wish you would all come and visit it. I assure you it is one of the lions of London. We have morning and evening prayers, lectures in the Mission Hall, and other services. Since that Sailors' Home was founded others have arisen in various parts of England and the world. From that, again, has sprung the Shipwrecked Mariners' Society, which has now an income of £20,000 a year. Institutions of this kind draw forth the thanks and blessings of our seafaring men, who go down to sea in ships, and see the great works of God, and perhaps from seeing the great works of God they are all the better prepared to receive the Word of God when they come home.

Rev. Theophilus Bennett, M.A., Eastrington Vicarage.

An old adage says, "A house-going parson will have a church-going people." I am a believer in that adage, and am rejoiced at what has fallen from the Rev. Dr Massingham, because I think in these days people are apt to ignore the more disagreeable work of visiting for the more agreeable of frequent services. For eight years in Ireland I was intimately acquainted with Roman Catholic priests, and never do I recollect them making one pastoral visit during the whole of that time. Visiting must be something of a discipline when the Roman Catholic clergymen shrink from it in this way. I was once with a rector who looked upon it as such a discipline that he left it to the season of Lent; and no doubt it is a discipline when properly done. It is also a nervous business. I shall never forget the first visit I paid. I was almost as nervous as the clergyman who trembled so much when he went to visit a washerwoman, that she encouraged him by saying, "It is as easy as possible: sit down in a chair, read a chapter in the Bible to me, and then give me a shilling." I once heard of a clergyman who carried this to such an extent that he always gave a shilling, and he consequently came to be in such demand as a visitor that his people used to ring him up at nights. He spoke to a tradesman about this, who immediately suspected the cause, and advised him not to give the shilling when he made a call—and the result was he soon ceased to be in demand. I think the best plan is to give our alms through our district visitors, so that when we call, our people know that we have come to give spiritual counsel and advice. Another thing with regard to visiting is that we ought always to have an object in view. I think it was the Rev. Alexander Dallas who said he tried to make his visits interesting in this way:—Before he visited, he looked at the register-book, and found out when one person was born and another married; he jotted these things down, and he would say to a child when he called at a house, "My dear child, yesterday was your birthday," or to the mother and father, "Your wedding-day was so and so." The result was that he won a great many people over to him. We all have a register-book. One of mine extended back to 1567, I believe, so that I could trace them a good way back, if necessary. One of the speakers said, "Visit everywhere." I endorse that entirely. I do not think we ought to pass any one by. In Plymouth, where there are representatives of every sect—Plymouth brethren in abundance, and Plymouth sisters in greater abundance, they told me I was going to try a dangerous experiment when I announced my intention of visiting from door to door. Nevertheless I said I would try it, and endeavour to do my duty by going from house to house consecutively. I never said a word of boasting until I arrived at the last house in my district, and then I said to the last lady, "I am very glad to wish you good-bye, and tell you that, though I have gone through the whole district, I have not met with an insult." I think the people in general like us clergy to visit them, whatever their particular views may be. It has been said at one of these meetings that the first thing to be done in straggling parishes is to get a good stout pony. I say, instead of that, have a good stout pair of legs, and drive *tandem* through your parish, putting one foot before the other. That is a great advantage, because then you are easy of access, the people have an opportunity of speaking to you, and you have an opportunity of going about more freely than you can with a stout pony. I often think what a blessed thing it was that our Lord went about on foot teaching and healing the people! I think we should follow our people everywhere, even to the alehouse. One of my rectors once said, "Don't be afraid to go to the alehouses," and he made me go through a certain part of Hertford, where about every second door was an alehouse, and I did not meet with an insult. Let us also follow them to the plough, and talk with agricultural labourers as they are ploughing, and try and get them to church. I have only a word or two to say about Bible-classes, and that is, have them in separate rooms. The other day I was in the place where Lord Selborne teaches his Bible-class at the top of Regent Street, and there I found that he has them in a separate room. Cottage lectures may be made extremely

interesting; they generate a beautiful spirit in the neighbourhood around, and win people over to the Church. Therefore I think we ought to hold them, and sometimes we can substitute for them lectures before the cottage. At Withington, near Manchester, once I remember we had too many people inside, and I suggested that we should go out; accordingly Betty Griffiths, in whose house I had intended to give the lecture, supplied me with a chair, which I planted and stood on before her cottage outside, and I got twice the number of auditors. Another thing I suggest is, when you go to visit the poor, be a good listener. Mrs Fry has written a book called "The Listener." We want to hear what people say, that we may know what they really want, and what they are; whereas generally we go to lecture them. Therefore I say to my clerical brethren and all visitors, be good listeners. When you visit a cottager, let him then have his innings. A gentlemen has talked about the ladies. I once heard a clergyman say, pointing to his wife, "That lady is worth two curates to me." Recollect, therefore, ladies, that saying, and let each of you be worth two curates in your respective parishes.

Rev. Henry Bowlby.

I AM very glad that district visitors have obtained a recognition in this Congress, because there is a little fear lest the claims of sisterhood and deaconesses should make us forget the value that ought to be attached to the work of district visitors. I believe that the work has been sometimes unduly spoken against, as I believe also it has been at times unduly magnified. Some excellent advice was contained in the first paper as to the selection and management of visitors. All clergymen who have had anything to do with them in their parishes must have felt aware that the weak point in the system is the want of regularity in their visits; but there are many who overcome this weakness, and are able to do their work punctually and regularly. Another difficulty is as to the suitable age for a district visitor. I am inclined to think they may be well chosen from persons of all ages, and that it is the due admixture of visitors of different ages which is the most advantageous in a parish; for whilst those of mature years possess greater experience, greater depth of judgment, and a more systematic way of pursuing their work, the younger ones bring, perhaps, more sympathy and kindness, with which we cannot afford to dispense. I do not of course assert that this spirit of genuine love and sympathy is in any way absent from visitors of more mature years, for it is not the case; nor do I assert that sound wisdom and perseverance are not to be found amongst the young; but it is generally found that the distinctive qualities of youth are zeal, heartiness, and love, and the more distinctive merit of maturer years is the wisdom and the regularity with which the good work is pursued. Bible-classes are a portion of the parochial machinery of which every day shows increasingly the value. More particularly is this the case with regard to Bible-classes for girls and young women. If these are conducted by the clergyman's wife, or any other lady who possesses the qualities of which I have spoken, a love for Christ and souls, sympathy and wisdom, they cannot fail to be productive of the greatest benefit. They take the girls at an age when they would not remain at the Sunday-school. There is a bond of union between the teacher and the class which is of the greatest value, and very often their whole future career is decided for good by the excellent advice which has been given by the teacher of the Bible-class, and also by her assistance in procuring for them situations in domestic life, or other employments. I entirely agree, with regard to the clergyman's own parochial visitation, that it is of the utmost importance that we should leave none unvisited; but I wish to add that this house-to-house visitation ought to be as little formal as possible, and in order to that it would be desirable to avoid taking one house after another, because you are watched, and the fact that you are seen going from door to door tends to invest your visit with a

formal and official character rather than with that of a sympathetic, kindly pastoral visit. Whilst, therefore, I earnestly recommend that no house should be left unvisited, I would recommend that the visits should be paid, not from door to door, but here and there sporadically, so that the clergyman should seem to drop in casually. Then the difficulty is how to turn your visit to the best account. This requires great wisdom, great possession of the mind of Christ, that tact and discernment which enable us to use our opportunities rightly and happily to avail ourselves of openings for speaking a word in season. I have for years thought that it is exceedingly desirable, if possible, to have a stated period at which our visits should be expected, and that they should assume the character of a pastoral visit rather than an occasional call. The occasional call very frequently involves inconvenience to the person upon whom the call is made. There is often much time lost through the fuss and excitement consequent upon an unexpected visit. If, like old Richard Baxter of Kidderminster, we could have a stated period at which our visits are expected at the house, and the whole household assembled to ask us questions or seek our counsel, such visits would possess much greater influence than they often do now. I bear my testimony to the fact, that no clergyman can preach effectually to his people unless he is, by frequent pastoral visitation, made well acquainted with their modes of thought.

Rev. Joseph Jordan, M.A., Vicar of Ogley-Hay, Staffordshire.

I am sorry to differ from our humorous friend Mr Bennett, but my decided opinion is, that it has been the twaddle that has been talked from house to house about when people were born and when they were married which has caused such a large number of Plymouth brethren and sisters in other towns than Plymouth. The pastor of a flock, conscious of the solemn charge laid upon him, had better stay at home than go amongst his parishioners to talk such small-talk as that. The particular point upon which I wish to speak is, that in the earnest, zealous spirit which has come over the clergy of this country with regard to their parish-work, and the heightened sense of their duty, I see a danger looming in the distance, and even present in some cases, of over-organisation. It is possible to have a well-worked parish on paper and not in reality. A man may get into such an organising grove that the natural and genial, and that which is likely to touch the heart, may be almost squeezed out of him. If I were the poorest cottager in a parish, paying 2s. 6d. a week rent for a thatched cottage, I should feel the dignity of the highest aristocrat if a clergyman came with his note-book in hand to tick me off after having dealt with my neighbour, and I should say, "Not at home." We should be able to carry out thoroughly whatever machinery we do set in motion in a parish, and the man is more successful who makes his small amount of machinery work thoroughly, than the man who has a great many machines at work, and is continually running from the one to the other, anxious lest they should be getting out of order. I know that if a man thoroughly realises his privileges, and consequently his duties, with regard to his schools, if he has a list of all the sick in the parish who not only need, but are willing to receive, his visitation, if he has certain other things connected with the Mission Funds, which we all agree should be in our parishes, there is very little time for the man to spend in other kinds of organisation. When he begins to organise, he should see that he has the people to work for him. It is no use for me to say I will have a mothers' meeting, if I have no one who can make all the arrangements; or that I will have a Penny Bank, unless I have some one who can keep a cash account. In fact, it is of no use to have any kind of organisation beyond that which I am capable and willing myself to continue,

unless I can be sure of some one else to whom I can delegate the work. I have learnt from experience, that a young man entering upon a parish burning with zeal and full of hope is in danger of making the fatal mistake of giving the people the impression that he is warm to-day and cold to-morrow. It is very often the case that it is not really so. His heart is as warm and zealous in three or four years as when he began, but unfortunately he has failed in this and the other scheme because he put so many irons in the fire at once. I heard a gentleman say yesterday that he would put all the irons in the fire, poker, shovel, and tongs ; but I do not see how he is to help burning himself with some of them, unless he is an unusually quick man at handling them.

Rev. Frederick H. Cox, M.A., Vicar of Tilney All Saints, with St Lawrence, Norfolk.

I should not have spoken, if it had not been for the quotation by a previous speaker of the adage, "A house-going parson makes a church-going people." I venture to think that the proverb is often so used as to become an exaggeration of the truth which it was meant to express. I agree with the last speaker that we do little good by perpetually worrying people to come to church. It is true you may get them to come occasionally ; but what is their idea in coming to church? They say, "I'll come to see you some day, sir." They simply return your call. I am a country vicar now, with not a large parish, but I have been in past years the pastor of a large parish in a colonial city, and I have tried the plan that I am referring to, and know well how it works. You do not, by simply calling on the people and trying to get them to church, represent to them the true relation between the pastor and his flock. Then how is this relation to be brought home to them? I say, first of all, let there be a true fire of devotion burning in the house of God ; let the warmth of that fire be felt by those who come to the house, and then let the faithful few, whose zeal for God has thus been inflamed, go forth and stimulate their negligent brethren about them. These faithful worshippers, whether they be district visitors or members of a guild, or simply Christian people, must be as the eyes and hands of the parish priest. Of course there will be many occasions calling the priest himself to visit his people, and he must take care to make the most of them. For example, a man may be known to be living in some grievous sin, and if the pastor of souls is faithful to God, he must warn that man. So again, if there be any sick, he must visit them. And here let me refer to a hindrance which clergymen sometimes meet with when they are refused admittance to the sick-room,—a thing that is especially likely to happen among the class immediately above the poor. They are told, "The doctor says he is to be kept quiet ; another day will be better." Well, that is a good opportunity for disabusing people's minds of the notion that prayer for the sick is only efficacious when offered by their side. A clergyman, in such a case, should propose in the room into which he is introduced to offer up prayers for the sick person in company with any members of the family who will join him, so leading them to understand the privilege and duty of intercession through the merits of the great High Priest. Just to revert to the point with which I set out, and to guard against being misunderstood, I think that we clergy ought by all means to visit and to know the people committed to our charge, and to find all reasonable excuses for doing so ; but I don't think that we are to call on them for the mere sake of putting down names, or saying, "Why don't you come to church?" That may be better done for us by others.

Mr E. B. Birks, of Trinity College, Cambridge.

It has been said that it would be better not to start any plans of work till the workers are secured. There is a story in the life of Mr Moody bearing on this question. He found a certain district somewhere in America that had been wholly neglected, and was in a state of heathenish darkness. He had a friend with him. He set about at once inquiring after and securing a room; and when he had got one, he went about telling the people that there would be services there throughout the next week, and begging them to come. His friend said to him, "But who is going to take those services? You know you are engaged elsewhere every day next week." He answered, "You are." "I! I never did such a thing in my life. I couldn't." "Oh yes, you can. You'll find, if you try." And the man did try, and, by prayer and study of the Word, he found he could. And that was the beginning of a great work in that district. So perhaps a little more faith is all that is needed. But my object in speaking was to ask a question. What is to be done with a man who has had a little too much liquor? I do not mean one who is regularly drunk, but one who has taken more than is good for him; whose mind can only admit one idea, generally one of self-complacency; who is ready enough to listen, and then start off volubly on his own theme without having taken in one word? I should be very glad if any one could tell me what should be done with such a man.

Rev. A. S. Cave Brown Cave.

Mr Birks has placed before me rather a difficult task; but as he has thrown it down for the succeeding speaker to give some solution of the question, perhaps he will pardon me if I tell him the course I always adopt. I have, as a country clergyman, many such cases to deal with, and I always feel that they are "weak brethren, for whom Christ died." I also feel that, however far they may be from what I wish them to be, if God is content to allow them to live on, we may hope that that is an evidence that there may be sooner or later repentance and godly fear on their part. Therefore I always follow the advice a drunken man once gave me. He said, "Sir, I am glad to see you; but remember, you may as well talk to a stone wall as to a man who has got any beer in him. If you will come some other day, I will listen to you; and if you will come often enough, I daresay you will keep me out of the beer-house." I met the man in the street week after week. He was a Dissenter; and every time I met him, when he saw me coming up one street, he would go a hundred yards out of the way because he was in beer. One day, however, I saw that instead of keeping out of my way, he met me, and smiled. That was an intimation on his part that he was in his sober senses, and that I might do him some good. From that day to the present his children have come to our church school; they are no longer Dissenters, but some of his boys are in our surpliced choir; and the man, I believe, will sooner or later be brought to full Church membership. I say, therefore, to our friend Mr Birks, take the drunken man's advice, and never speak to a man in that condition; but keep your eye upon him, remembering that the biggest weeds grow on the best land. With regard to cottage lectures, I started one in a country parish where there seemed at first some little prospect of doing good. I went into a place, however, where there were only three houses together; but none of the tenants would speak to each other. They therefore would not come into the house. "No," they said, "we cannot, because we do not speak." "I don't ask

you to speak, but we can pray together." After some reluctance, one woman said she would not mind the others coming into her house, but she would not speak to them. We met together. I read the chapter in which is the passage, "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he love God whom he hath not seen?" We then repeated the Confession, which was followed by several of the Church prayers, and then they walked out, but did not look at each other. It went on again every week, but for four or five weeks they would not speak. It so happened that one of them came into trouble, and this was sufficient to unlock their mouths. This is nearly six years ago, and for a long time they have been fast friends, sitting with one another on Sunday evenings; and I believe that not only are they heirs together of life, but I am sure that their prayers are not hindered by strife and quarrel. I mention that as an instance of what may be done where there are only three houses together. Now let me say a word about not having classes where you have not teachers. I went one day into a house where the woman was at the washtub, and the husband happened to be at home. I asked him afterwards, "Why do you not read for yourself?" He said he could not read. "But," I said, "why is it you are so fond of your cockfighting and dog-fancying? Is there not something better than that which you can do?" He answered, "I cannot sit in the house all the day with my children, I cannot drink, I cannot smoke, I cannot read a letter of a book. I like my children, certainly, but I like something else to devote my mind to. I don't do any particular harm that I know of. I should be delighted if I could read." I said, "Then I will teach you." "Will you?" "Yes." He challenged me to do so. That man was the means of getting together no less than sixteen of his companions, who all met on a Monday night (I met them last Monday); they can all read and write, and they know the use of the Book of Common Prayer. I would impress upon my clerical brethren, not only to have Bible-classes but also classes where you will teach young men and young women the order of our services and the arrangement of the Book of Common Prayer. I know the case of a lady who would sit in the free seats of her large parish church in preference to cushioned benches, and kneel on the dirty floor rather than on comfortable hassocks, and who has before her on the Sunday evening young men who will hand the Prayer-Book to her to find the place for them. Whilst those young men were talking and chattering when they did not know where the clergyman was, as soon as their place was found for them, it stopped their tongues, and they were willing enough to pray when they knew where the prayer was. To return to the class of the dog-fancying men, they said of their own accord, "We must have a Sunday-school." I said, "My good men, I cannot teach you on Sundays." "Then we must get some one," they said. I walked down the street feeling that my heart was in my hand, as it were. The class would certainly be formed; where was the teacher to be found to deal with dog-fanciers, pigeon-fliers, and that class of men? In answer to a prayer I had offered up privately in my church, I determined that the first man I met, whether I knew him or not, should be the man I would ask. I then met a man coming up the street, whom I did not know to be a God-fearing man. He was a soldier who had recently come into the parish. I said to him, "I want a teacher, can you teach?" His answer was, "All my life I have been in the army. I have been a non-commissioned officer for years, and this is the very thing I have been wanting to do, and I will do it with all my heart." I say, therefore, if ever you want a teacher, go into your own churches, kneel down in private, and God will find the means.

FRIDAY EVENING, 8th OCTOBER.

FINAL MEETING.

The Final Meeting was held in the Congress Hall, the Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

The RIGHT REV. THE PRESIDENT.

SPECIAL PRAYER FOR THE PRINCE OF WALES.

The President said, "I wish to call attention to the special prayer which will be offered up for the Prince of Wales in view of his sailing from this country for India on Monday next, that God might give him a safe passage, might prosper him there, and restore him safely to his own country." The ordinary prayers of the Congress were then offered up by the Rev. Sir L. T. Stamer, who acted as chaplain to the Congress throughout the week, and the following special prayer was added :—

"O God, whose never-failing Providence ordereth all things, both in heaven and earth, we beseech Thee to take into Thy gracious keeping, Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, on the distant journey he is about to undertake. Preserve him, we pray Thee, from all evil accidents by land or by water; from the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and from the arrow that destroyeth in the noonday. May he prove a messenger of good-will to our Indian fellow subjects, binding them together in loyalty to our sovereign, and in peace among themselves. Restore him, we pray Thee, in health and safety to his own land, and in the remembrance of Thy manifold mercies may he live long to glorify Thy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

ARCHDEACON EMERY.

MY LORD BISHOP,—The first business is to announce to the Congress that the Executive Committee to-day have decided unanimously to accept the invitation of the Mayor, the clergy, and the inhabitants of Plymouth to hold the next meeting of the Church Congress in that town; and to state that the Rev. C. T. Wilkinson, who has come as a deputation from Plymouth, has stated that the Bishop of the diocese will have great pleasure in presiding. The next business is to pass a few resolutions, and I believe the Mayor of Stoke is in possession of the first, which he will now propose.

The Mayor of Stoke (Mr C. Dickinson).

My Lord Bishop, my Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen,—The resolution I have to propose is :—"That the hearty thanks of this Congress be presented to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield for his self-denying exertions on behalf of this Congress, and for the fatherly and impartial manner in which he has presided." I feel that I am incompetent to do full justice to this resolution, but I am ordered to move it, and I must not shrink from the duty imposed upon me as the representative of the town, however unworthy I am. When it was proposed a year ago to hold the Congress at Stoke, I felt some doubt and misgiving as to whether it was not too great an undertaking for us; but I knew it was in the hands of Sir Lovelace Stamer, and that he was a man of great energy and determination of character, and if any man could carry it to a successful issue, he would do so. I knew, also, that the Lord Bishop of the diocese had consented to preside, and therefore I felt confident that all would go on well in his hands. From his lordship's world-wide experience of mankind, as having been a colonial bishop, and as having visited the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, I felt satisfied that he would preside worthily and with dignity over this assembly, and I feel sure that you will all agree with me that he has done so. When he came a few years ago into this diocese, he was rather a stranger to us; but since he has been here he has won golden opinions from all sorts and conditions of men, not only amongst the clergy and laity of the Church of England, but also amongst the great body of Dissenters. In addition to this, his lordship has taken a high place among his fellow-bishops; and he is, I believe, greatly valued in the country at large, both in counsel and in action, as a distinguished religious director in this great empire and nation. It has been arranged that the resolutions shall not be seconded, and therefore I have great pleasure in proposing that this resolution be carried by acclamation.

The resolution was passed amidst enthusiastic applause.

The President.

My dear friends, one of the first lessons I learned after I became a bishop, a great many years ago, from Bishop Broughton, at that time the only bishop of our Church on the other side of the globe (where there are now seventeen)—a bishop whom I regard with the greatest reverence—was that a man ought never to be thanked for doing his duty; and I have simply done my duty as bishop of the diocese. Before I pass on the thanks to Him to whom alone they are primarily due, I pass them on to those who, without any assistance from me, have conducted all the preliminary arrangements. Of course, I refer to the Executive Committee, and especially to the Rector of Stoke, Sir Lovelace Stamer. I may also add that the venerable Earl of Harrowby, when resident in London during the session of Parliament, repeatedly attended the meetings of the Executive Committee, coming down from London in the morning, and returning in the evening. I think you will agree that for a man over eighty years of age, that showed great earnestness in the cause. To his Lordship, therefore, and to the other members of the Committee, I tender my thanks. But, dear friends, we are all aware that whilst we thank one another for the service God has enabled us to perform, the praise is really due to God alone, and to Him I desire you now, as I do myself, to lift up your hearts in fervent and devout thankfulness for the successful issue to which He has enabled us to bring this great undertaking. I thank Him especially for the influence which this Congress has night after night exercised over the inhabitants of this neighbourhood. It was a wise plan to issue tickets for the evening meetings, and nothing has interested me more

than the sight of the large assemblies in this hall every night, notwithstanding many attractions elsewhere. I refer more especially to last night, when the parish Church was full, the sermon being preached by one of our most eminent clergy, Dr Farrar, and when the sectional meeting in the Town Hall was also fully attended, yet, notwithstanding these attractions, this hall had scarcely room for one hundred additional persons. How then, after we have spent four whole days in listening to words of wisdom without a single word of strife or bitterness, can we do otherwise than lift up our hearts in thankfulness to our God who has sent among us the Spirit of peace, and who has enabled us to keep the unity of that Spirit in the bond of peace.

Earl Nelson.

Fellow Churchmen and Churchwomen,—The resolution which I have been asked to propose is:—"That the thanks of this Congress be presented to the mayors and corporations of Stoke, Newcastle, Hanley, Longton, and to the civil authorities of the several other towns in the Potteries, and to the inhabitants generally, for their hearty reception of the Church Congress, and their kind hospitality to its members." I am glad that it has fallen to my lot to propose this resolution, because I represent the strangers who have come "from afar" to visit you at this place so well known to all, Stoke-upon-Trent. I have observed, in common with all those who have attended the Congress, how wonderfully the mayors and the civil authorities have thrown themselves in their official capacities side by side with the Church in this matter. At the opening services we saw all the mayors and many aldermen filling conspicuous places in the Church, and going there (very properly) in a formal manner; and afterwards I think there were no less than four mayors of the neighbouring towns on the platform at the first meeting of the Congress. Besides that, I am able to tell you a little more, and I draw your particular attention to the latter part of this resolution, which proposes thanks to the inhabitants generally, as well as to the mayors who are the elected representatives. I was one of those who were requested to address a free sectional meeting at one of the outlying towns in the Potteries, Longton, and I was supported by the mayor, who, although, I believe, a Wesleyan, had been present at two or three of the meetings, and told me that he had been very much interested in the discussions. He very kindly took the chair at that meeting, which was attended by, I should say, at least 800 people, and I never had the pleasure of addressing a more attentive audience. I have had the high privilege of enjoying the hospitality of your bishop at Lichfield, but I know many of my friends who have partaken of the hospitality of the people of this neighbourhood, and I will ask them to allow me in their behalf to offer their thanks for the kind hospitality which they have received.

The resolution was carried by acclamation.

The Mayor of Stoke (Mr C. Dickinson).

My Lord, Ladies and Gentleman,—I thank you most heartily for this kind expression of your feelings. I do so, being fully aware of our shortcomings. I know that we have not been able to offer you such accommodation as you have been accustomed to have in larger towns. We are a young corporation, and therefore we have not a vast town-hall capable of accommodating you all; but we have endeavoured to construct a suitable temporary building, which I hope has given you satisfaction. Stoke is rather a gloomy

place in October, and I hear you have had an unfavourable opinion of it; but, fortunately the weather has been fine, and that has been a great advantage. Englishmen think a great deal about the weather; we are happier and more comfortable when the sun shines, and we have been greatly favoured upon this occasion. Although we are not blest with the beautiful sky of Brighton reflected in the blue sea; although we cannot show you the grey walls of Bath, which claim an historical character; although we cannot offer you such a noble place for holding the Congress as the Pavilion, nevertheless I hope that our hearts have not beaten less warmly towards you than the hearts of the inhabitants of those more favoured towns. I have never before had the pleasure of attending a Church Congress, and I confess to you from what I have read in the papers, and from what I have heard of the proceedings at Congresses, that I have not been very favourably impressed, and that I have not thought these meetings have been a benefit to the religion of this Church and nation. I have read and heard that men have expressed rather strong opinions in, as it has appeared to me, an unwise manner; but I am bound to confess that on this occasion there has been nothing of the kind. The readers of the papers have all seemed to be imbued with the solemnity of the occasion, to be impressed with the feeling that they had a responsibility in the opinions which they sent forth to the world. Therefore I must say I feel that this Congress has been indeed, as it was hoped it would be, a blessing. Whether this has happened from the great judgment and discretion with which our bishop has conducted these meetings; whether it has been also from the care of the committee to select only moderate men; whether it has been from the business character of our district, or from the feeling that we are overshadowed by a vast body of working men, perhaps 70,000 or 80,000 looking on our proceedings, so that perhaps the speakers felt that they must not split straws about 'isms and their peculiar opinions, but that it more worthily became them to advocate the cause of religious truth so as to draw these 70,000 or 80,000 men to think more of their Creator, to feel that there is a Power on high which directs the works of man—whether it is owing to one or any of these causes, I will not say. In conclusion, I would remark that this and the neighbouring towns have been very much gratified in seeing you here. I thank the Lord-Lieutenant and the mayors of the neighbouring towns for giving us their presence and support upon this occasion. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for coming here from, I may almost say, every quarter of the world, and I hope when you return to your homes you will take back with you a kindly feeling and a pleasant opinion of the people of Stoke.

Charles Longuet Higgins, Esq.

The resolution I have to propose is—"That the cordial thanks of the Congress be presented to the various readers and speakers for their valuable assistance." I am sure I can speak for you from the experience of my own heart, which has been greatly warmed and stirred up during the few days of this Congress by the admirable addresses to which we have listened. The learning, the ability, the godly earnestness and fervour which have run through the whole are a great cause of thankfulness, and I trust that we shall all go back determined to spend the few days which may remain of our life more entirely to His glory, and for the good of those over whom we may have influence. I was told when this resolution was put into my hands, that I should express my admiration of the way in which people of different views had been drawn together by unity of feeling; but I cannot do anything of the sort. I do not think there has been, or that there should be, any merging of things which differ into one and the same. I am not at all an advocate for doing away with differences where they really exist, but

I can and do most cordially congratulate this assembly on something better than that, namely, on the forbearance and Christian charity exhibited throughout all our meetings.

The resolution was carried by acclamation.

Rev. E. H. Bickersteth.

It is only at the command of our excellent secretary that I rise on behalf of my colleagues to express our hearty thanks to you for carrying by acclamation this vote of thanks to those who have had the privilege and responsibility of speaking in our Master's name. If Plato said that he was the happiest man and the richest man who had the opportunity of scattering germs of thought in the minds of his hearers, I am sure that we, who are disciples of that Master who said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," can only thank Him for the privilege of having been permitted to say any words in His name; and I am sure that we and you will alike find that in this work of exchanging thought we have experienced what Shakespeare said of mercy—"It is twice blessed: it blesses him that gives and him that takes." I heartily thank you.

Rev. R. W. Randall.

The singular unanimity of this Congress seems to be mounting to its climax on its last evening, as indeed it should, and the resolution I have to place before you is one that will, I think, bring that unanimity to its highest point. It is this:—"That the sincere thanks of the Congress be given to the Executive Committee for their arduous and successful labours." I have to couple with this the name of Sir Lovelace Stamer, the Rector of Stoke, and one of the secretaries of the Congress. You are assisting, let me remind you at this moment, at one of the most remarkable working-men's meetings that you could possibly assist at. As one who has worked a little upon a Committee of Congress, let me tell you that there is some very hard work to be done by those who make the arrangements for the addresses and speeches which we have been so richly enjoying the last few days. I do not think that the members of the Committee, especially when we remember that the Congress has been held in the good town of Stoke, will feel insulted if I compare them to some very useful but very little noticed officers of our railways, and say that they are a body of excellent stokers. If I may still carry a little further my railway figure, I confess that sometimes during our meetings here I have had some fear whether the steam might not have been a little too much suppressed here and there; but however much the steam in the shape of applause may have been suppressed, such has been the skill of the engine-driver, that though the boiler has been at boiling-heat, we have had no bursting of the boiler; and such has been the singular care with which the train has been conveyed from station to station, that we have had no collisions; and I venture to say that it may be recorded of the Congress of Stoke that it has kept safely and surely upon the grand old lines of the Church of England. I am sure that you will not forget that we owe our safety in these matters largely to the care which the Committee have exercised in the choice of speakers; and I must add that we owe our thanks to them for the admirable manner in which they have quartered us upon the hospitable inhabitants of this district.

The Mayor of Newcastle.

My Lord Bishop, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution, and, to carry the railway illustration a little further, I may safely say that the real safety-valve which has kept all this great machinery at work and in good order has been the true spirit of English courtesy with which this Committee have managed the whole affairs of this Congress. The borough which I represent is, I believe, one of the oldest in the country, having obtained its charter in the year 1172, in the nineteenth year of Henry II.; and I can only say we look upon it as a sort of shadowy honour which we obtain through this Congress, having been received in our neighbouring borough of Stoke-upon-Trent. I myself am glad of this opportunity of making one remark, which, I think, will do something towards removing an imputation under which our borough might rest in consequence of a statement which appeared in the "Daily Telegraph." In a leading article upon the Church Congress, I believe it was stated, after referring to the antiquity of our borough, and the modern character of the borough of Stoke-upon-Trent, that we look upon the borough somewhat in the light of a vulgar upstart. Such words as those must have been coined in the mint of the "Daily Telegraph" itself, because I do not believe myself that there is a single person in the borough of Newcastle-under-Lyne who would ever think, much less say, such a thing with reference to what we consider a neighbouring thriving and friendly borough.

The Rev. Sir L. T. Stamer.

My Lord, Members of Congress,—I dare not take to myself—though my name has been coupled with this resolution—more than that fraction of thanks and goodwill to which I am entitled as a member of a very large Executive Committee. The number of gentlemen going about with red and blue rosettes will assure every one that there has been a large army working for this end. Any one who knows what the work of preparation for a Congress like this really is, must be aware that no single hand could have carried it to a successful issue. Much has been said, and happily, as to the unanimity and goodwill which have characterised the proceedings of the Congress. But I am reminded to-night of the old saying that no man must be pronounced happy till the day of his death; and the Congress being about to expire with a musical session, and knowing as I do that musicians are as likely to get into collision as any other body of men, it is just possible that a collision may happen. Still, ladies and gentlemen, I do venture to hope that we shall all look back upon this Congress with blessed and happy recollections. The peculiar happiness, blessedness, peace, and order which have characterised this more than any other Congress, have been due, in my own opinion, to the constant and fervent prayers which have been offered up on its behalf. It was due to the happy suggestion of your coadjutor, my lord—I mean Bishop Hobhouse—at our first Committee meeting, that the prayer for God's blessing upon this Congress was prepared and placed in the hands of hundreds and thousands, who have offered it up to God; and I believe that the spirit which has actuated the Congress is due to the earnest, fervent intercession with God that He would give wisdom to our bishop and the clerical and lay members who have been speaking or attending at this Congress. I hope and trust that the good custom begun at Stoke will be continued at successive Congresses, and that all who are likely to take an interest in them will be equally blessed as we have been. I do most heartily thank the Committee of last year for having accepted the invitation to come to Stoke. It was a bold thing even to think about, but I am bound to say that the idea of bringing it here did not originate with us. In their wildest moments of ambition such a thing would never have crossed the minds of any in-

habitants of Stoke; but a telegram came down to me two years ago from Bath to this effect—"If the Congress invites itself to Stoke, will Stoke receive us?" My answer was—so confident was I of the goodwill of the people—"Yes;" and I have not been disappointed in the ready willingness of all parties in this and the neighbouring towns to receive the members of the Congress. And now I must congratulate the Permanent Secretary on the prospect of the immortality of Church Congresses. I believe they have taken a new lease of life from Stoke. I trust that Archdeacon Emery may be permitted for many years to see the succession of Congresses continue, and I am sure that he will have reason to be thankful that he was minded to bring the Congress here; and I trust that the new spirit, if I may so say, which has pervaded this Congress will influence Church Congresses from this time forth.

HYMNS AND HYMN-SINGING.

PAPERS.

The Rev. John Ellerton.

The branch of this subject with which I am now about to deal, is the Present Condition and Future Prospects of Congregational Hymnody in the Church of England.

All of us, probably, are aware that the present condition of our hymnody is one of rapid—some would say of too luxuriant growth. That growth is not restricted to our own Church or nation. The old distinction between Lutheran and Calvinistic communions, that the one were singers of hymns, the others of metrical psalms, bids fair to be entirely abolished before the present century comes to a close. Among French Protestant congregations "Chants Chrétiens" in one form or other (some of them translations of English hymns) have all but superseded the psalms of Marot and Beza, just as among ourselves Tate and Brady have fallen into disuse. Even the old Scotch Psalms are slowly giving way before the newer rivals, and each of the chief Presbyterian communions in England and Scotland has its own modern hymn book in use or in progress. Among ourselves the revolution is now virtually completed. Two results have followed. The first, the vast impulse given to the multiplication of hymns; their free and abundant employment among us,—their interpolation at various points of our regular services, their value in the various special services which have arisen among us—children's services, mission, choir-gatherings, and the like, their evangelistic use, on which I do not now dwell—all this has enormously augmented their power and their popularity; and has, of course, tended to multiply their number. Then while the twenty-five years from 1835 to 1860, will be marked by future hymnologists as the age of translations, the time when Latin, and to a less extent German hymnody was made available for congregational use among us, the fifteen years which have since elapsed have been years of almost unexampled fertility in the production of original English hymns. Doubtless many of these will ere long be disused and forgotten. But it is to be noticed that these new hymns are not mere additions to our stock. They are displacing the older ones to a great extent. While the best of the early Evangelical and Wesleyan hymns are, I am convinced, valued by church-

people far more than they ever were, it is worth remarking how few of them appear likely to remain in use. I may take as representatives of modern Church hymn-books, three of those which now command the largest sale—"Hymns Ancient and Modern," Mr Bickersteth's "Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer," and the new "Church Hymns" of S.P.C.K. Out of Watts' 720 hymns, five are in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, eleven in *Church Hymns*, while but twenty-eight survive even in Mr Bickersteth's. Of the 348 Olney Hymns Mr Bickersteth preserves twenty-one, *Hymns Ancient and Modern* but four, *Church Hymns* but six. Notwithstanding the strong reaction in favour of Charles Wesley's hymns, *Hymns Ancient and Modern* gives us out of the twelve great volumes but thirteen hymns, *Church Hymns* twenty-three, and Mr Bickersteth's thirty-six. Of the other hymn-writers of the eighteenth century, about ten of Doddridge's, two or three of Toplady's, and a few single ones by other writers, are the most that will be found in the books mentioned. Later authors, such as Bishop Heber and James Montgomery, are of course men largely represented. These statistics will show that it is not mere addition, but displacement, which is occurring. I do not mention this with unmixed satisfaction. In the "struggle for life" of hymns it is not always the fittest which survive. Happily, in their case, disuse is not always death. It may be that the calmer wisdom of a future generation will in some cases revise the hasty judgment of our own day, and restore to our children some of those words which animated the praise, enshrined the experience, and cheered the dying hours, of saintly men and women whose names still dwell among the hallowed recollections of our own childhood.

Next,—This increased use of hymns has of course brought with it a great change in our hymn-books. But we must not conclude from this that the number of hymn-books published has increased in the same proportion. Local selections, so common in the early years of this century, have almost disappeared. One after another, large and important hymn-books for general use have arisen; each of these has killed off many small competitors, and the number in future seems likely to be diminished rather than increased. Such local books as now appear, are mostly mere supplements to one of these. Already, a clergyman seeking to introduce a new hymn-book into his congregation, is likely to make his choice not, as till lately, from among some twenty or thirty, but from among seven or eight at the most.

In turning to the FUTURE, it is natural to ask, if the tendency of the Church of our own time is thus to the widespread use of a few large hymn-books, is it possible or desirable to go a step further, and concentrate into one national book the few that seem likely to distance all competitors? Or is it to be desired that at least a certain number of hymns, which are common to all these books, should be authorised, and congregations be left at liberty to add to these according to the taste of those who are responsible for their hymnody? Each of these questions I feel bound to answer with an emphatic "No."

I do not think we are ripe for the interference, to such an extent, of authority, with the free development of our hymnody. A comprehensive hymn-book must do one of two things; either it must contain hymns the language of which would be so repellent to the view of many congregations

that they would bitterly resent its being imposed upon them by authority; or it must omit and alter to such an extent that congregations which use existing books would be no less disturbed by the loss of teaching to which they are attached. We may deplore our present divisions; we may hope and pray that they may be healed; but for all that we ought to deprecate such an attempt at ignoring them as would severely test an obedience which is not too readily rendered even now, and would turn our very songs of praise into watchwords of theological strife.

And as to the selection of certain hymns common to all, I doubt whether it is known how few in number these are. The great and excellent collections of hymns which the last few years have produced are separated from each other by strongly marked lines. Each covers its own ground, each has its own distinctive character. Thus, to refer again to the three books I have ventured to take as representatives, the revised *Hymns Ancient and Modern* contains 473 hymns, *Church Hymns* 592, the *Hymnal Companion* 400; yet out of this large number of 1465 hymns, there are but 129 common to all three books; and of these 129 the text occasionally differs in particulars which the editors of each would probably consider vitally affecting the value of the hymn. It might be convenient to represent these by consecutive numbers, common to all three books; but I cannot think that very much would be gained by authorising so small a fragment of our immense hymnody. It has been urged indeed that an authorised hymn-book would benefit us by fixing the standard test of the hymns we use, especially if the rule were made of restoring every hymn to the exact form in which it was originally written. On any other principle, indeed, uniformity in the wording is under present circumstances as hopeless as unanimity in the selection of hymns. And yet I own I can scarcely imagine an editor of a hymn book who has carefully investigated the original text of hymns, seriously desiring to print every hymn exactly as it was written. Many of our old friends it would be absolutely painful to recognise in their resuscitated dress. How many of Faber's, for example, could be included as he wrote them, in a National Church hymn-book? Hard things are often said by living writers as to the mutilation of their hymns by compilers. May it be permitted for one whose own hymns have not escaped this unpleasant process, to say a word on the other side? that any one who presumes to lay his offering of a song of praise upon the altar, not for his own, but for God's glory, cannot be too thankful for the devout, thoughtful, and scholarly criticism of those whose object it is to make his work less unworthy of its sacred purpose. A Church hymn-book is not a statue gallery erected that men may pass through it and admire the skill of each artist; it is a temple for the worship of the Most High, in which every stone, rough-hewn or cunningly carved, is fitted to its place and subordinated to the one spirit which informs and consecrates the whole.

Must we then be content to give up all prospect of a national book of Common Praise to match our book of Common Prayer? If what I have said seems to discourage such an expectation, let us remember that Colonial Churches, or Nonconformist bodies among ourselves, are too small and too homogeneous to be any true precedent for the great and complex Mother Church at home. The true precedent, I fear, would be that of modern Ultramontanism, which seeks to impose upon every country

and diocese alike its own inflexible Roman Breviary, and in so doing is destroying multitude of hymns and sequences far better than its own.

Some appeal to authority, indeed, all will surely allow. There are frequent public occasions upon which many would welcome the authorisation by our bishops of special hymns as well as of special psalms and lessons. There creep into churches now and then hymns which I venture to think ought to be formally prohibited. Above all, the change of a hymn-book is a matter so important and interesting to a congregation, so deeply affecting its life and unity, that it seems only reasonable to require that the sanction of the Bishop should be sought and obtained in all cases by the clergyman who proposes to make the change.

But the true hope for unity in our songs of praise lies, I am convinced, in a very different region from that of law and prescription. It is not pressure from without, but the impulse of new life from within, which alone can draw us nearer. Our hymnody must be the expression of that life, or it is unreal and worthless. As in each congregation, in each soul, spiritual life becomes deeper and fuller, those hymns will be loved and valued, and those alone, which have in them that true inspiration. And those hymns, whether ancient or modern, whether English or foreign, whether Catholic or Protestant in their origin, will be welcomed and used; not all at once, perhaps, not without hesitation and questioning; but if slowly, yet surely and permanently. Look at our greatest hymns; it is not authority and custom that have made them dear to every congregation; it is not always literary excellence; it is not even in every case theological accuracy; it is a true correspondence with thoughts and aspirations that filled the heart of the Church. The whole life of the Patristic Church is in the *Te Deum;* the whole awfulness and pathos of the Middle Ages is in the *Dies Iræ;* the whole gospel of Evangelicalism is in *Rock of Ages.* And whenever a hymn arises which thus says what we want to say, it must make its way, and be heard, and live. When growth in spiritual life shall have brought with it unity of spirit, then our songs will be uttered with one accord. Who would substitute for *that* unity the uniformity of compulsion, of indifference, or of compromise?

My conclusion then is, that the future of our Church hymnody can be but the reflection of our own future. What our congregations are, what the Church is, that our hymns will be; true and strong in faith and love, or false and weak, empty and lifeless. And that, therefore, the way to improve our hymnody, the way to guide it, the way to restrain it, is primarily, and above all, the discipline of our own hearts. This will give us self-restraint in our choice of hymns; it will save us from being carried away by mere fashion and caprice; from being slaves to the latest novelty, the lilting chorus, and the taking tune. But especially I would plead with my brother parish-priests, upon whose choice depends what their congregations week by week, and day by day, shall thus utter before God, to feel the greatness of their responsibility, and to grudge no time or pains in the selection of the words they put into the lips of their people.

Let me urge them to remember how this work of selection, well done, may not merely form the taste, but elevate the religious tone of our congregations. Is it then a task to be hurried over in two minutes, while the choir are waiting to begin practice? Is it a matter to be left to a

young schoolmaster, or a group of young ladies? Is our chief care to be that the tunes are pretty and popular, and the words something that will "go with a swing"? Are we thus to sanction the trash which, alas, will find its way even into good hymn-books—artificial bursts of enthusiasm—sentimental complaints of weariness, or sorrow, or even longing for death—feeble and confused dilutions of the imagery of the Apocalypse—exaggerations and affectations doing duty for precision in doctrine and sincerity in feeling? Ought we not rather to pray and to strive that the hymns we invite our congregations to sing may be Scriptural, not merely in their phraseology, but in their inmost spirit, reverent not in form only but in meaning, definite with the certainty of faith, calm with the consciousness of God's presence, lowly with the reality of penitence, joyful with the sincerity of thankfulness: that so, whether we prepare to enter into His gates with the thanksgiving of our glad processionals, or to speak good of His Name in the quiet hymn of the daily office, or to fall low on our knees before His footstool in the Litany of Penitence, we may be emboldened to say for ourselves and for our people, "Thou shalt open our lips, O Lord, and our mouth shall show forth Thy praise."

Rev. S. J. Stone, M.A., Vicar of St Paul's, Haggerston, London.

My endeavour will be in this paper to say a few words simply on the other than congregational use of hymns and hymn-singing. It is an aspect of the subject which seems to me to have received as a general rule scarcely sufficient notice; and which has commended itself to my reverent attention as a parish priest by many happy memories of practical result for good easily attained. In making allusion to parochial experience in this matter, I am not referring to clerical work only, but to that also which has been done by Church workers of every kind. Both clergy and lay-helpers have, in the other than common or congregational use of hymns, a means for good of which many take but too little advantage. I will endeavour to illustrate this use first in the case of the visitation of the sick. Just as the frequent introduction of hymns into our general services in places where they are neither enjoined nor suggested by the rubric, has become universal wherever it is possible, so is it surely equally justifiable to introduce hymns into any or all of the services appointed for the visitation of the sick, and into any kindred efforts in their spiritual behalf. Nor is it necessary that these hymns should be sung. Where this is possible, it will obviously be an advantage (provided always of course that the sick person can bear it), whether the singing be by the clergyman alone or by other visitors and friends of the sufferer: nevertheless the simple reading or saying of the hymns may not only be very effective, but, in some cases, as for example where the sufferer cannot use a book or does not know the hymn well, this latter course is to be preferred. I do not see why the plan should not be generally carried out, not only in cases of ordinary visitation, but also at the private administration of either of the Sacra-

ments. For years I have never administered Holy Communion to the sick or dying without introducing at least two hymns either at the beginning or in the course of the office. It arrests attention, excites interest, and I have never found that this practice was unappreciated: generally it has been received with a strong, sometimes with an intense, expression of gratification. I would venture to recommend that for such purposes the clergyman should get by heart a certain number of hymns, and say them rather than read them. A dozen or twenty hymns so committed to memory, and made use of with slow and careful and reverent utterance, are a valuable possession to the parish priest. Or let him have them ready to hand in his Bible, or prayer-book, or manual. Certain other suggestions I would make in this connection; and these are: first, that he should use a wise discretion in his selection of the hymn or hymns, in careful consideration of the age, intelligence, and former associations of the sufferer; in cases of special weakness, or with the dying, rather choosing the oldest and best-known of his collection, such as "Sun of my soul," "Rock of Ages," "Jesu, lover of my soul," "When I survey the wondrous cross," and the like. Secondly, that in any case, and particularly with a new hymn, the singing or the repetition should be preceded by a few words of explanation of its contents and purport. Thirdly, that the hymn, if it be one of prayer or adoration, rather than of praise or of meditation, should be said kneeling, and said slowly, and that the sick person should, according to discretion, be asked to join in while it is said, or to follow it silently in heart and mind. Just as it may be often noticed that dying adults or children, who have become almost unconscious and incapable of speech, will evidently follow with their looks, if not with their lips, the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, when no other prayer appears to be understood; or sometimes will try to make, by an inclination of the head upon the pillow, the wonted reverence at the adorable Name; so sometimes the repetition of an old familiar hymn will have power to evoke some manifest recognition, and kindle the features of the dying into animation and response. Fourthly, the remarks and application made on any reading from Holy Scripture may be well accompanied or succeeded by some hymn or hymns in harmony with the line of thought or exposition. And here I may be allowed to note in parenthesis the value of the occasional use of hymns as the subject-matter for sermons, especially mission sermons, and for expositions made to the Bible-classes of associations and guilds, and to mothers' meetings, &c. There are hymns which can be so used to illustrate all phases of religious subject, doctrinal, practical, ecclesiastical. Again, recurring to visitation, it may be very useful in some instances, especially with the young, to endeavour to teach the sufferer a verse of a hymn, to be remembered with some verse of Holy Scripture, for use in the intervals between the visits of the clergyman, or in the night watches. These suggestions—most of which I am well aware will be familiar to many of my brethren in the ministry—have been made so far mainly with reference to pastoral visitation. Nevertheless, much that I have said applies, of course, to those also of the laity who do what they can to minister to the sick, whether of their own family and in their own neighbourhood, or in the office of lay readers and mission-women, or as district visitors. "I was sick, and ye visited me" will be said hereafter not only to faithful clergy, but to those of the laity, men and women, who have done

what they could to be spiritually helpful to the old and infirm members of the one body. I am acquainted with the case of a district visitor who, in the lengthened absence through illness of the Rector of a country parish, endeavoured to do all that she could for the love of Christ among those in need. She visited one old woman, whom she found longing for, but not possessing, the peace that passeth all understanding, which belongs only to those who personally realise the truth of the Cross, the Atonement of our Redeemer. Do what she could, the lady for many months was unable to win her to this blessed conviction of the Saviour's perfect work. At last she tried all the hymns she could remember; and it was by one of these, which she had never said before, that the Holy Spirit convinced the longing heart of the Redeemer's righteousness, and the hymn became from that time her daily and hourly treasure, and it was on her happy lips when a few months later she died. Of such conversions, and, too, of much blessed edification and comfort, by the special instrumentality of hymns so used, I am thankful to know many instances. One or two additional suggestions occur to me in special relation to work of this kind. In the first place, clergymen will do well to employ the vocal ability of some of the most earnest of their young communicants, by sending them to minister delight to such of the aged and infirm within their cure, particularly those under chronic affliction, who would consider half an hour's singing or chanting in the prison-house of their room, or by their bedside, as an earnest of Paradise breaking upon their dreary hours of suffering and solitude. This might be reckoned as one of the minor particulars of Church work committed to societies and guilds. There are some poor folk that I know who look backwards and forwards to such visits as they would remember and anticipate those of the angels. Some visitors prefer to go alone; others, sisters for example, will go in pairs; sometimes a group of three or four might go together. Sunday-school teachers should be encouraged to take like opportunity of doing good and giving pleasure in the cases of sick children belonging to their classes, whom they visit in their illness at home. And here I may add that the well-known characteristic of infant-school teaching so often productive of delight to the parents and of present and future good to the children—I mean the systematic instruction in hymn-singing—might be made more generally a feature of the Sunday-school teaching of older children, only that in their case the hymn learnt by the child should be made the basis of a special lesson by the teacher. This suggestion applies also, of course, to the religious instruction given by the day-school teachers. Again, where there are in a family a sufficient number, whether of its actual members or of its servants, to ensure fairly effective singing, the pleasant and profitable habit which prevails in many families of singing hymns together on Sunday evenings might become a part—so far at least as one hymn or chant is concerned—of morning and evening family worship. And why should not masters and mistresses, or the elder daughters of a family, if they possess the ability, and have or will make the time, show their Christian interest in their servants, if they have several, and do good and get good by instructing them in effective psalmody, and encouraging them in every way to make themselves, according to their own private opportunities, well acquainted with the hymns, and proficient in their proper musical rendering? But both in family

hymn-singing on Sunday evenings, and also in such work of instruction as this, care must of course be taken that due reverence should mark the fact (so often and notably *not* the fact in secular singing) that the words and not the music are in this case chiefly important. It may take a little from the dryness of a paper like this, made up of simple suggestions, to introduce an illustration which bears upon the last remark, and upon the prime necessity of heart service in all psalmody. It is from a quaint mediæval story which I lately met in a short poem illustrating religious simplicity. Seven holy men dedicated themselves to God, and in a forest glade built a chapel. But they were old, and not musical, and their bishop, therefore, gave them permission simply to say, instead of singing, their chants and hymns. But he positively excepted the *Magnificat*, which they were directed to render musically as best they could. So says the poem—

> "So every day at vesper-time *Magnificat* was heard,
> 'Tis said that from the boughs above it frightened every bird,
> For all were out of tune and each a different chant did try,
> But up in heaven, where hearts are known, it made sweet melody."

One Christmas Eve, however, a young stranger joined them, to whose exquisite singing they listened with delight. But, continues the poem—

> "But had they marked the stranger's face, and seen how all his thought
> Was on his own melodious voice—how *self* was all he sought,
> They would have known that up in heaven that voice was never heard,
> For though the birds came flying back, Christ could not hear a word."

At the close of the office an angel appeared demanding why no praise had been offered on that eve, and thereupon in fear they dismissed the melodious stranger, and

> "Bursting forth into the chants it was their wont to sing,
> High up in heaven their hymn of praise with fervent heart they fling,
> And the angel bare it on with him to heaven's Lord and King."

I have not time to allude at length to the private use of hymns, involving not only their reading and consideration, but possibly, also, under certain circumstances, their singing also. Why should not this be more common among devout Christians? Why should not the workman or the workwoman, if alone at their toil, and afterwards at their ease, solace the one and consecrate the other by such singing? Why should not the traveller brighten his solitary journey by singing the Lord's Song in a strange land, and so find Him near, and the far-off spiritual city in clearer view? Why should not all, for whom such utterance is possible, from time to time at all events add to their private devotions such a morning or evening sacrifice of praise? Not much musical ability or knowledge is necessary for such a use of the songs which the great Church-Mother has given to all her children in Christ. At all events, if we never attempt to give musical utterance in private to the hymns we know, it is none the less a thing much to be desired that we should, from the beginning of our sensible, spiritual life, lay up in heart and memory a store of hymns of which we can make use from time to time, and for the possession of which in later days of sickness, perhaps of more frequent solitude and heaviness, we shall devoutly thank God. Surely the great poet of the Anglican Church comprehended in the intention of the well-known verse

with which I close this paper, not only the general melody of faith, hope, and love abiding in the heart of the true Christian, but also those especial songs, inspired and other, which bring before him most musically the subject of his faith, the object of his hope, and the vision of the Lord Whom he loves.

> "There are, in this loud, stunning tide
> Of human care and crime,
> With whom the melodies abide
> Of the everlasting chime:
> Who carry music in their heart,
> Through dusky lane and wrangling mart—
> Plying their daily task with busier feet,
> Because their secret souls some heavenly strain repeat."

The following paper by Mr E. J. Hopkins, was read by the Rev. Sir Lovelace Stamer:—

The subject on which I have been invited to offer a few observations this evening is that of "Hymn-Singing." By this term is, I think, to be understood congregational singing—good congregational singing. For a choir has at the least its weekly practices, from which its own improvement or increased efficiency may fairly be expected; whereas the members of a congregation have but few opportunities of rehearsing or even of consulting together; and the more pressing question, therefore, is, by what means can the most united and excellent singing practicable be secured in such an assembly, under circumstances which, though undesirable, are scarcely avoidable.

Among the questions that at once present themselves for consideration, as bearing upon our subject, are the following:—(1) At what speed should a given hymn-tune be sung. (2) Is it necessary or expedient that a short rest be made at the end of every line or every second line of a hymn-tune; and if so, can the length of the rest be accurately defined, so that the congregation, one and all, may recommence with confidence and unanimity. (3) Is it advisable to perpetuate the old custom of doubling the length of the first and last notes of every line of the common measure, long and common metre Psalm-tunes. (4) Should provision for breath-taking be made and recognised. (5) Is the retention of the use of a double-bar at the end of every strain of a hymn-tune desirable; and if so, can its usefulness be extended. (6) What can be done, after a tune has been sung through once, to secure a firm and unanimous commencement of the second verse, and the same with all succeeding verses.

A clear conception upon all these points is necessary towards making up what is conveyed in the term "good congregational hymn-singing;" and if a few of the results of upwards of forty years' personal experience and observation will in any way conduce to that *end*, I shall be extremely pleased.

And first, as to the speed of a hymn-tune. Three different times have prevailed at various periods, and which may here be conveniently distinguished as the slow, the moderate, and the quick times. The slow time was prevailing in the seventeenth century. The question might suggest

itself how this can be positively known, seeing that the ingenious little machine with which most of us are now so familiar, called the *metronome*, and by the aid of which musical time is now so generally recorded, was not invented until about sixty years ago. This is indeed true; but there previously existed what may be termed "*nature's* metronome," namely, the *human pulse;* and to that the old writers frequently appealed. Thus I find an anonymous writer of the latter part of the seventeenth century mentioning in the quaint and genial language of his time, that the syllabic or unit note of a Psalm tune was sustained for "about the duration of two pulses at the wrist of a person *in good health and temper*" (!) Now taking the human pulse to beat eighty times in a minute, which is the full average, we get at the fact that the normal length of a unit note was *a second and a third* of time. The same writer further relates that singers were seldom so exact as to keep that time, and that it was the habit of the greater number of congregations and families to sustain every note for about *three* pulses. This would make a unit note somewhat more than two seconds of time in duration. It would be difficult to conceive that the more jubilant psalms, with their flowing melodies, could ever have been sung at so spiritless a time; and in justice to our forefathers, it should be mentioned that they recognised also a somewhat quicker time, though whether it was made available appears to be more than doubtful. So long ago as the year 1718 Dr Watts wrote thus:—"It were to be wished that we might not dwell so long upon every single note, and draw out the syllables to such a tiresome extent, with a constant uniformity of time which disgraces the music, and puts the congregation quite out of breath in singing five or six stanzas; whereas if the method of singing were but reformed to a greater speed of pronunciation, we might often enjoy the pleasure of a longer psalm, with less expense of time and breath; and our psalmody would be more agreeable to that of the ancient churches, more intelligible to others, and more delightful to ourselves." The Rev. Dr Vincent, in 1787, delicately suggested that "it would facilitate the ear and enliven the sensation of the mind, if the alteration could be made of playing the original psalm-tunes to somewhat quicker time;" while Dr Burney, who went in for a little plain speaking, said—"The greatest blessing to lovers of music in a parish church is to have an organ in it sufficiently powerful to render the voices of the clerk, and of those who join in his outcry, *wholly inaudible!*" Pepys, in his Diary, has placed on record a specimen of congregational singing of an offertory hymn, the length, time, and object of which would astonish most congregations of the present day. Under the date January 6th, 1660–61, he says—"To church, where before sermon, a *long* psalm was set that lasted *an houre*, while the sexton gathered his year's contributions through the whole."

Although the slow time had so long been a source of complaint, yet about the year 1826 an important work on psalmody was published in which that blemish was sought to be perpetuated. In the publication referred to, the Old 100th and Luther's Hymn were each marked to be sung at the rate of two seconds of time to each unit note; and even that tortoise pace was described over the commencement of each tune as only being "*rather* slow"!

In the year 1843 a gentleman who had not only the opportunity but the will, Mr John Hullah, inaugurated a much better state of things by at once

increasing the normal time of metrical psalmody to *nearly twice* the speed just indicated; and that too, without losing sight of the deliberate time due to the stately chorale on the one hand, or of the more animated time proper for the more jubilant and tuneful melodies on the other. It was at the first series of public performances given by Mr Hullah's "Upper Singing Schools," in Exeter Hall, that the first successful public effort was made to raise the condition of metrical hymn-singing in this country, by including in the programmes psalm-tunes that were sung at an accelerated time, and in a better style than till then had been the custom. The improvement was on all hands acknowledged to be great; and being received with special favour, the "moderate time," as I have designated it, was accepted, and in a very short time generally adopted. A few years afterwards the time was further increased, bringing in what has already been indicated as the "quick time."

Such is a brief outline of the history of the speed of hymn-singing in the English Church. I must now leave this subject for a while.

Our next question is, Is it necessary or expedient that a short rest be made at the end of every line, or every two lines, of a hymn-tune? At the period when metrical hymn-singing first became popular in this country, and for a long time afterwards, the general education of the people stood at a very low ebb. As a rule they could not read, even supposing books had then existed in sufficient abundance to enable them to do so; and the words of a psalm had therefore of necessity to be read to them aloud, a line or two at a time, which portion was then sung. Referring to some of the old copies of the tunes, we find that the first and last notes in each line were, as a rule, notes of double duration: I say as a rule, because occasional exceptions occur to the custom; and not only so, but misprints of almost every conceivable kind were both numerous and constant. We further find that at the end of every second strain of the music, a two-beat rest was introduced between and in addition to the two-beat notes already spoken of. In the early part of the seventeenth century bars began to be occasionally and sparingly used, up to which time the double bar at the end of the tune was the only one employed. The rests in those places were then omitted more frequently than not, the bars alone being taken to indicate a resting-place, as it has continued to do down to our own time in the case of tunes written in the ordinary metres. The introduction of a rest at the end of a greater or less number of the sections of a hymn-tune, without doubt, therefore, originally sprang from a *necessity*. That same necessity does not exist now; and it remains to inquire whether a slight cessation may not be convenient on the score of allowing breath-taking time. For the present it is sufficient to say that the breath-taking power varies in different persons, and that a congregation will of necessity present three classes of singers: the expert, the average, and the less expert; the well-trained, the moderately trained, and a third class among whom may be included most of the young and the aged, those who are only acquiring their muscular activity, and those who are losing a little of it.

The fact of the first note of so many of the fine old tunes being printed in a character representing a sound of double the average duration, when the accent of the words fell on the second syllable, thus bringing about a direct jar between sound and sense, was, there can be little doubt, due in the first instance to the inexact singing of the unsteady timists of

the period. Their habit would seem to have been not to take breath until others began to sing; the result of which would be, those who took up the first note quickly would have to wait some additional time while the inexpert singers first got ready and then produced their note. There exists, however, no necessity for perpetuating a habit that seems to have so little to recommend it. And this leads to our next question, as to whether provision should be made and recognised for breath-taking? The time ordinarily occupied in drawing in the breath varies with different persons, but it is sufficiently near the average to consider it to occupy a second of time. An ordinary inspiration is equivalent to about half a singing-breath. A full singing-breath more nearly resembles in quantity the long deep inspiration we call a sigh, and has to be drawn in as rapidly as may be, and expended as slowly as may be. There are two ways, in one or other of which the opportunity for breath-taking is provided during the singing of a hymn. Either a rest is introduced for the purpose, which is frequently observed at the end of each section of the tune, or a shorter opportunity for doing so is obtained by subtracting a portion of the time due to the last note sung previously to the breath-taking, and devoting that to the purpose. The length of the added rest can always be well defined; and it will be easily understood and observed by a mixed congregation if it be made of simple rhythmic proportion, as for instance of a single beat in length. The subtracted breathing-time can at most be only half the length of the note from which it is deducted, so that when a tune is sung at a moderate speed, say at the rate of a second of time to a unit note, the breath-taking time will be half a second in length at the outside; while in the case of a tune sung at a quick time it would of course be proportionably shorter.

Having now noticed most of the divisions of our subject separately, we may proceed to group them together, and consider their bearing one on another.

Mendelssohn, in his oratorios and other works, has marked by the metronome the time he considered to be the best at which to sing the chorales he has introduced into his productions, and that time varies according to the style of the words and tune, from slightly over a second to rather more than a second and a half to a unit note. There is therefore an exact accordance between Mendelssohn's moderate time and that introduced by Mr Hullah some thirty years ago, which coincidence is the more interesting as it was beyond doubt quite undesigned. It will be convenient, nevertheless, to consider here the unit-beat note as being exactly a second of time in duration, as we shall then be relieved from the necessity of constantly thinking of aliquots. Besides that, its observance may serve a practical end. Nearly every gentleman's house, and every farmhouse in England, contains a large clock, which generally beats "dead seconds." If the second, then, be taken as representing the unit-beat for home practice in the case of the broader among the old tunes, a metronome for reference will always be within ready reach. The old clocks, indeed, were frequently turned to advantage in this very manner in the last century. Thus, in one of the old books of that time the advice is given to "stand by a large chamber clock and beat the hand or foot to the slow motions of the pendulum, and leisurely to tell one, two, three, four, to a semibreve, the minim being described as being "half so long in time as the semibreve." The old slow time, therefore, for the tunes in common

measure was, as already explained, two seconds to the minim and four to the semibreve, with which each strain of the tune frequently begun and ended. A second sort of common-measure time was also known, which, we are told, was a little faster than the other just mentioned. We have, however, fortunately simply to consider the tunes as sung at a more reasonable speed.

The tunes that need our first attention are those in the Iambic measures, and common time, known as "common" and "long" metre respectively. A common-metre tune in this time commences naturally with an unaccented or up-beat, which may conveniently be preceded by a silent down-beat. A single-beat rest after the unit-note at the end of the first three sections of the tune would allow sufficent breathing-time in those places; while a note of somewhat less than two beats in length, followed by a short rest, would mark the close of the tune; while the two rests together would allow of a little repose for the lungs, and yet admit of the breath being prepared for the recommencement of the tune, which would then begin afresh on the fourth beat from that on which the concluding note was sung. This arrangement is applicable to a tune sung to the moderate time indicated by the metronome set at sixty, or by the beat of an old clock, such as the old melody called Windsor.

For a tune taken at a somewhat quicker time, say at seventy-six of the metronome, it will be found convenient, perhaps, to make the note at the end of the second section *two* beats in length, followed by a silent rest; and the concluding note *three* beats in length, succeeded by a unit-beat rest. In that case the tune would recommence on the *sixth* beat from that on which the closing note was sung. The tune named St Magnus well admits of this treatment.

In long-metre tunes, as in common, the speed to some extent regulates the details we are considering. For instance, in a tune sung in moderate time, that known as Spires, for example, a single-beat rest at the end of the first three lines will be sufficient; while at the close, a note of a beat and a half in duration, followed by a half-beat rest, as in our first common-metre illustration, will complete the requirements, the tune recommencing on the *fourth* beat from that on which it terminated.

The triple-measure tunes can be much more easily dealt with, for many of them, as, for instance, Bedford, Burford, Angels' Hymn, &c., have a two-beat note at the end of every line; consequently, a fair amount of time can be subtracted from the literal length of the terminating note to allow for refilling the lungs without disturbing the time. When, however, two single-beat notes occur instead of one of double length at the end of a line, care must be taken to cut the second one short, neatly and quickly, or it will be impossible to be ready to sing the following note exactly at the commencement of the third beat.

Short-metre tunes are easy to deal with, as the note at the end of the first and second lines can be made of double length, followed by a single-beat rest. A unit-beat rest can be inserted after the third line, and the final note can be sustained for three beats, the tune recommencing on the sixth beat from that on which it closed. Many of the modern hymns are written in metres that admit of the concluding syllable of each line being set to a note of double length, to which hymns not only have new tunes been written that justly enjoy great popularity, but the metre of the words permits the tunes to be sung at a quick speed, that is, to the "third

time" referred to at the commencement of this paper. We have by no means exhausted this division of our subject, but time will not permit of our following it out any further.

We will therefore proceed to consider the question as to whether it is advisable to continue the use of double bars in a hymn-tune. For some centuries it has been the custom to separate the several sections of a metrical hymn-tune by a sign of some kind. In the sixteenth century that sign was ordinarily a rest; but in the early part of the seventeenth century a single bar came to be used for the purpose. Afterwards, when the custom arose of dividing the music off into measures by means of single bars, as in the present day, then a single bar was no longer a sufficiently distinctive sign between the clauses of the tune, and a double bar was accordingly employed. The old compilers evidently looked upon such landmarks as being of great practical utility; nor is it necessary to seek far to discover what that might have been. Only a single verse of the words could be printed with the music, the remainder was therefore either placed below, or even on the opposite page; and it was doubtless considered to be of assistance to have beacons, as it were, to assist the eye back to the music after it had traversed to the words to ascertain their meaning and import. There is more to be said, therefore, in favour of the retention of the double bars than of their exclusion. Nor is their utility incapable of being extended. Thin double-bars, as well as thick ones, might be used; the former in those places where the time is to be preserved, and the latter where a unit-beat for breathing would be convenient. Where thick double-bars are retained, the pause sign, or a figure "1," might be put where a breathing-rest is to be observed.

But some might be disposed to look with disfavour upon breathing-rests, on the ground that they will disturb the *time* of the tune. Now it can never be too distinctly borne in mind that *time*, however useful as a guide, is not always good as a dictator. In helping one to sing a succession of notes at their corresponding or relative value, it acts the part of a friend; but in urging one on to a continuous effort, and not allowing sufficient time for inspiration or repose, it acts the part of a tyrant. The human lungs are not formed like an organ-bellows, possessing the twofold power of collecting and of exhausting atmosphere at the same moment. They can only perform one of these functions at a time; and as breathing-time must be had somehow, it must be secured in one of two ways—either time must be *allowed* for it in certain situations in the tune, or it must be *obtained* by shortening the concluding note of the strain to the extent of about one-half, and devoting the time so subtracted to the refilling of the lungs. A shorter or *half* breath, quite sufficient in many places, is not so in all. In the act of ordinary breathing, the inspiration takes, on an average, about a second of time. In singing, a fuller breath is frequently required, which is taken either in that time or in less; and an average singer will make that breath last about six or eight times as long as is required for its preparation.

When the necessary breath-taking time is not sufficiently recognised and allowed for, although the wood-and-leather bellows of the instrument experiences no inconvenience, the singers become distressed, and all kinds of inaccuracies are very likely to ensue. Of this I had a striking illustration in a country church not many weeks ago. The tune was played at a quick time, without the observance of any breathing-pauses,

and in the return from the end to the beginning of the tune, the interval or "break" was never of the same length twice in succession. In the first verse the choir kept moderately well with the accompanist; but the congregation made a late start, and lost ground as the tune proceeded. In the second verse the choir was in the first few notes slightly after the accompaniment, while the congregation, for the most part, were a whole note behind. Thus three different tunes were going on at the same moment. In the third verse the accompanist reduced his speed to that at which the choir were singing, and in this manner the time was gradually modified from quick to moderate as the hymn proceeded, until, arriving at the last verse, they were all together, the choir having joined the congregation and the accompanist the choir, the congregation being left masters of the situation. An exhibition betokening a greater absence of discipline, or one less calculated to foster "good congregational singing," it would be difficult to conceive. Another incident bearing upon our subject occurred a few years since, which produced a great impression upon me at the time, and which has frequently recurred to my memory since. I attended a church where great attention was paid to the congregational singing, except as to the one subject of appropriate speed. Next me, near to the west end of the church, stood a decent, clean, reverent old man, who strove patiently to keep pace in the hymn; but after sundry ineffectual attempts to do so, he raised his eyes, our glances met, and with a faint smile and a sigh he closed his book. If I read his thoughts aright, they were of sorrow that he could no longer enjoy the privilege of pouring forth his feelings of gratitude and thankfulness for the comforts and blessings that had been vouchsafed him through what had been permitted to a long life. At the opposite end of the church all was excellence, youth, and vigour; yet I could not suppress the thought as to whether the "experts" might not have made a little concession for the sake of the comfort and convenience of the "average and the less expert" members of the congregation.

I should mention that to many of our modern hymns admirable and appropriate tunes have been set by Dr Wesley, Dr Dykes, Henry Smart, and others, which are practically easy to sing at the quick time—which, in fact, were written to be so sung—and to which, therefore, no allusion can be intended to be made in what has been just said.

An old custom used to prevail, and is still continued in many places, which is of great utility—I allude to that of playing out the whole of the hymn-tune previously to its being sung. By this means not only is the tune announced beyond doubt—for we are not without coincidences, such as the first phrase of two different tunes being alike—but the exact time at which it is to be sung is made known; also, whether breathing-rests are to be observed, and if so, where, and of what duration; and further, if there is to be a slackening of the tune in the last line, and in that case the *extent* of the deviation. Thus while the congregation are turning to the words of the hymn the organ refreshens their memory as to the music if they have rehearsed it, or gives them a perfect lesson in it if they have not; so that, provided only that the reasonable convenience of the congregational vocal capacity be considered, there could be no reason why the many hundreds of singers forming the assembly should not, with ordinary attention on their parts, sing together as with one voice. Playing over a portion only of the tune, and that sometimes faster than it is

intended it should be sung, does not meet all the contingencies just mentioned, and so does not help forward the cause of "good congregational singing" so much as it might.

I cannot conclude without earnestly entreating those who have the power to do so to uphold the credit and the style of our English metrical hymn music. I just now referred to the welcome addition to our stock of tunes that had been made in the shape of several intended to be sung at a quick time. But others have more recently entered the field that are both fast in character and slight in texture. These have so little of the breadth and substance that should be found in all ecclesiastical music, that, tried separately from their words, they would scarcely seem to have been designed and dedicated for religious use in a sacred building. It is of course quite comprehensible that for children's hymns, to be sung at children's services, tunes of a more than ordinarily light and attractive character may sometimes be considered to be admissible; yet while it is only natural that children, as such, should think as children, it is equally to be expected that those who have arrived at man's estate shall, in music as in other matters, have learnt to put away childish things.

Most of us remember Pope's satirical lines—

> "Light quirks of music, broken and uneven,
> Make the soul dance upon a jig to heaven."

And surely we ought not, therefore, knowingly and deliberately, to encourage the introduction of tunes which, by reason of their greater lightness and fastness, would render the lines just read even more applicable to our own day than to the period at which they were written. In a sermon preached not long since at the opening of a new organ, the Bishop of Chichester is reported to have said—"Music should encourage and increase devotion; but this can never be the effect of music which is devoid of that plain, sober, and reverent solidity which true religion requires." Truer words than these on the subject of Church music were never uttered, nor words more worthy of being present constantly in the minds of those engaged in its cultivation or dissemination.

The President.

My Friends,—It is desirable, on all occasions where money is given, that a public account should be rendered of our stewardship, and I will now state to you the financial result of this Congress. The Members' tickets sold were 1832; the day tickets were 1404. Now I come to the item which, I confess, is of all the others the most pleasing to my mind—evening tickets 4356, which is an average of about 1100 every night. The total result of the receipts from these different classes of tickets is £1069. The cost of the building is £1600; and when everything has been paid, the total expense will probably be about £2000. The guarantee fund, which is almost complete, amounts also to the sum of £2000. Therefore we who have put down our names to the guarantee fund have the very great satisfaction of knowing that we have been the means of giving a real Christian source of enjoyment to 4356 persons at the small loss of one-half of the amount of our contributions to the guarantee fund, and remembering that, I for one (and I believe I speak in the name of all the contributors) will gladly give my quota. And now I desire to say a few words in conclusion upon the subject of this evening's papers—Praise. If I had more time, I should have been glad to have discussed with my friend Mr Ellerton the question of an authorised hymnal, because upon that point (and upon that point alone) I differ from him. I am not now about to fulfil the hypothetical

prediction of Sir Lovelace Stamer as to the danger of discord upon a musical subject. I mention it because it touches a very pleasing recollection in my past life in the Church in New Zealand, where we had an authorised hymnal. It is a most pleasing fact that the chief promoter of that hymnal was the Attorney-General of New Zealand, at the very same time when the Attorney-General of England (now Lord Selborne) was preparing his "Book of Praise." I think it is a remarkable encouragement to all laymen who are engaged in the law or in other professions which are supposed to withdraw the mind from holy things, that two eminent lawyers on opposite sides of the globe were engaged at the same time editing hymns of praise. My friend Mr Stone remarked that the two hymns which appeared in the greatest number of hymnals which he had examined were "Sun of my soul," and "Rock of Ages;" and I am glad to tell you that the New Zealand authorised hymnal was compiled on the plan of selecting the best hymns. We had before us nearly a hundred hymn-books, and the two hymns which came to the top of the list were "Sun of my soul," and "Rock of Ages." There are some who think it almost hopeless and visionary to look forward to the union of all Christian men upon the basis of necessary Christian truth; but those who know how far different in the eyes of the world John Keble was from Augustus Toplady will be thankful to acknowledge that in the work of praise, as the poet teaches us to believe, "such harmony is in immortal souls." I wish now to give a word of caution and pastoral advice to those whom God has enabled to sing His praises. Those who have witnessed the gathering of parish choirs in our Diocesan Cathedral will unite with me in thanking God for the impulse His Spirit has given to the work of praising God in His holiness and in His power; but I must add this caution to parochial choirs, as one to whom God has not given the power to sing His praise, and for myself and all who are in the same position St Paul supplies the comfort that we may make melody to God in our hearts; but to those whom God has enabled to sing His praises, let me from the same apostle draw these words of caution—Pray with the spirit, and pray with the understanding also; and again, "Sing with the spirit, and sing with the understanding also." In the days of my youth I can remember that the singers, after they had done their special work, drew around them the curtains which concealed them from the congregation, as if their work was over. Nothing of the kind prevails now, but there may be the danger of those who sing in our country parishes thinking that the music is the real business for which they come, and that they may neglect the lessons and the sermon. And now, dear friends, I do beg you from St Paul's most plain words to remember that no man can sing God's praises but with the understanding and the spirit; and that no man can sing in that manner unless he also prays with the understanding and with the spirit. The whole service, from beginning to end, is joined together in one harmonious symphony. I have a still more solemn parting word to address to all those who have never yet been able in their consciences to come to the highest of all acts of praise—the Holy Eucharist. I would just say (and I hope you will forgive me if I use strong words) that they thereby cut themselves off from the very highest act of praise to which the soul of man can attain upon earth. As our Blessed Saviour drew His illustrations from the simple objects of nature around, so I may call to my aid this evening as my contribution to the harmony of the evening, the words of Waller:—

> "The lark, that shuns on loftiest boughs to build
> His humble nest, lies silent in the field;
> But if the promise of a cloudless day,
> Aurora, smiling, bids him rise and play;
> Then straight he shows 'twas not for want of voice
> Or power to rise he made so low a choice;
> Singing he mounts, his airy wings are stretched
> Towards heaven, as if from heaven his voice he fetched."

All those who are communicants will understand the illustration when I appeal again to the inmost feelings of their hearts in the most solemn act of praise in our Eucharistic service. "Lift up your hearts"—and when the Holy Spirit of God moves you to answer, "We lift them up unto the Lord"—then it seems to me as if at once the songs of earth were joined with the melodies of heaven—"Therefore with angels and archangels, and all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy Holy name, praising Thee, and saying" [here the whole audience with one accord stood up, and amidst the most profound silence the Bishop proceeded]—"HOLY, HOLY, HOLY, LORD GOD OF HOSTS! heaven and earth are full of Thy glory! Glory be to Thee, O Lord, most high!"

The Right Rev. Prelate then dissolved the Congress with the Apostolic Benediction.

THE SERMON

PREACHED IN LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL, BY THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF LICHFIELD,

On Saturday, October 9, 1875.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth."—Ps. cxxi. 1, 2.

I will not detain you with any lengthened inquiry into the origin and meaning of these "Songs of Degrees" or "Psalms of the Ascent," as they might be called, of which this is the second. They were evidently composed at different times, and for different purposes. But it is not improbable that they were grouped together and thrown into their present form for the use of the Jewish exiles after their return from their long captivity in Babylon to their own land. And if this supposition be correct, it is possible that this 121st Psalm may have been chanted by the returning people, when they first caught sight of the familiar mountains surrounding Jerusalem, or as they began the ascent of the steps to the temple. The pilgrims look eagerly towards the "holy mountains;" and they ask—for the words most naturally assume the form of a question—"From whence shall my help come?" and the answer is not far to seek. First their own faith replies, "My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth." And then as they approach nearer and nearer, they see the Priests and Levites standing on the heights of Sion, awaiting their arrival. A little nearer yet, and they hear in animating strains the encouraging response—"He will not suffer thy foot to be moved. He that keepeth thee will not slumber. Behold, He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep. The Lord is thy keeper. The Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand. The sun shall not smite thee by day, neither the moon by night. The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil. He shall preserve thy soul. The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth and even for evermore."

It is with words such as these, Christian brethren, that we, the Priests and Ministers of this, the Mother Church of this Diocese, would greet you this morning, coming as you have done from the Congress just

closed, to join with us in our daily prayer, and to receive the parting blessing from our Chief Pastor, before the steam engine hurries you away from our midst, and carries you back to the ordinary pursuits and engagements of life. We have been occupied the last few days with counsels and suggestions for increasing the prosperity and efficiency of our National Church—for repairing her waste places—for setting in order the things that are wanting—for giving her greater power of expansion—for strengthening her outward defences—for quickening her inward life. And now you come hither, closing the Congress, as you began it, with high and holy service; and thus showing your conviction that for all this you need the help of God—not the help which supersedes the necessity of human effort—but rather that which alone can make your endeavours of any avail, and without which they would be ineffectual and vain. We know that "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it;" and yet we know that God leaves none to themselves but such as depend upon themselves; and that whilst we faithfully make the effort, He will graciously vouchsafe the assistance.

And what encouragement there is in the thought that He to whom we look is "the Lord that made heaven and earth." The surest title to protection, and the most powerful guarantee for it, is creation. It is so in human things. What a man has made becomes, as it were, a part of himself, the product of his own thought or toil. No one would willingly destroy the results of his own genius, or skill, or labour; on the contrary, it is this which encourages men to achieve these triumphs of art, and to erect those monuments which shall perpetuate their names after death. It is thus—and we need not look further than to this elegant sanctuary for an illustration—it is thus that gifted and holy men have rejoiced in the opportunity of accomplishing works which may delight the eye and satisfy the taste of future generations—which may help to inspire reverence, and to lift up the soul to God. Surely such a structure as this is the expression of the mind and purpose of those who reared it; and thousands from age to age have had their devotional feelings quickened as they have gazed upon its soaring spires, its vaulted roofs, its storied windows, its mellowed light, its deepening shadows; or as they have listened to its holy music, now lingering and wandering with sweet and plaintive echoes through its long drawn aisles, and now bursting forth with triumphant and joyous strains which fill the sanctuary of God. Thus such men as Chad and Clinton and Langton and Heyworth and Hackett, and a host of others, who have helped to build, to rebuild, or to restore, have transmitted the impress of their genius, their labour, and their piety, leaving their noble examples to be the strength and the solace of those who have come after them. And so, if I may presume to compare human things with divine, this glorious universe in which we dwell, this magnificent palace of our King, is the expression to us of His infinite perfections. There is not an impress of greatness upon the visible creation which does not remind the man of thought and of faith how powerful and loving a guardian and upholder he has. Nay; how can we Christians forget that He who made heaven and earth is our Redeemer, who has shed His own precious Blood to create the Church which is His body,

and which is dear to Him as the apple of His eye. Before Him we bow, who, though He was crucified in weakness, is nevertheless the Omnipotent; and acknowledging the ever-living God in the suffering Man, we can say as members of His body, with the humble confidence of faith, "Our help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth."

Now it appears to me that this lesson of quiet dependence upon God is one which the Church much needs to lay to heart at the present time. We live in an active, but at the same time a restless, feverish age. It is an age of great material progress. We have been enabled to achieve unprecedented triumphs over nature; and hence we are prone to exult as though our own hand or our own power had gotten us these things. And the spirit of the age has its effect, whether for evil or for good, upon the Church. Impatience of authority—liberty, sometimes, alas! degenerating into licentiousness—these tendencies too often appear within the Church herself, to the triumph of her foes and the sorrow of her true friends. But the age has its good as well as its evil—and whatever it be, the Church thrills and vibrates under its influence. The Church shares in the activity and energy which has penetrated every institution. Witness the gigantic efforts that have been made within the last fifty years to promote elementary education throughout the country. Witness the millions of money that have been spent during that period upon church building and church restoration. Witness the revival after a hard struggle, and amidst much contempt and obloquy, of the Convocations of the Clergy, which have now recovered much of their rightful influence in the constitution of this Realm, and which, even by those who dislike them, are now at least treated with respect, because they are felt to be a power. Witness the growth of Diocesan Synods and Diocesan Conferences. Witness the continued interest in these annual Church Congresses. That a Church, whether welded together, as our National Church is, with the State, or altogether separated from it—that a Church under any conditions should have some power of self-legislation, and some form of Synodical action, is a principle which has always been recognised at least in theory. Indeed, no society can long exist in healthy, vigorous life without some form of self-government. And these Church Congresses, exceptional, as no doubt they are, and irregular as they may possibly appear in certain respects to some, are nevertheless the expression of the wants of the Church, and have greatly stimulated our more primitive and constitutional action, through the Diocesan and Provincial Synods. They have thus helped us to realise the true theory of our Constitution, in which the two estates, the Spiritualty and the Temporalty, have their own proper spheres, with the Sovereign supreme in both. But not in these, important though they are, lies the true strength of the Church—no, nor in the logical skill, the profound learning, or the fervid eloquence of gifted men—not in the excitement of crowded and enthusiastic assemblies—not in animated debate, sometimes mingled with human passion and infirmity, from which, however, of God's goodness, the Congress just ended has been remarkably free. The true strength of the Church lies in the lifting up of heart and hand without ceasing to Him who is our only Helper, and who keepeth Israel with the eye of love and the hand of power.

And, thank God, our Church is thus lifting up her eyes. There are now few districts to which we can go and not find daily public morning and evening prayer—few where a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion is not within reach. The conscience of the Church is roused, and it will be quickened more and more as the conscience of each individual member of it is stirred. It is good that we should meet together—that we should take counsel as to our common interests—that we should provoke one another to love and to good works. But that which will give effect to all—that which will bind us together—is the ever-growing conviction that our help cometh—not from anything of earth—not from worldly state or power—not from the temporal or secular accidents of the Church—but from Him who is the Head over all things for His Church, and who governs and sanctifies it by His Holy Spirit. This alone can preserve us in purity, in strength, in unity, and in peace. It is in this quiet, spiritual influence—for it is in the "still, small voice," that God is heard—it is in the sound and sober teaching of her Bishops and Clergy, it is in the consistent and holy lives of both Clergy and People, all supported by the grace and power of God—it is here that our true strength lies.

And so we will return, God helping us, to our several callings, braced and refreshed by the intercourse of the last few days—each resolved to do something more than we have yet done for God—something more for the peace and efficiency of the Church—renouncing all confidence in our own strength or wisdom, and trusting only in Him who hath made heaven and earth, and who is a most strong tower to all them that put their trust in Him. Let us show forth habitually our belief in the great verities of our religion—the Incarnation of our Lord, His Cross and Passion, His glorious Resurrection and Ascension, the presence of His Holy Spirit in the Church, His future coming to judgment. Then will He be our Helper in all the trials and vicissitudes of life. Yea, when our work is over here, and we yield our place to others—and even now, as we have gathered together this morning, we hear of another who has just gone to his rest, the good Dr Forbes, Bishop of Brechin—yea, as we pass through the valley of the shadow of death, we shall be able to lift up our eyes and see the brightness of the everlasting hills, and be brought of His mercy to His holy temple, to go no more out for ever. AMEN.

CHURCH CONGRESS, STOKE-UPON-TRENT, 1875.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS.

RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
To Tickets sold—			
1801 Members' at 7s. 6d. each . . £675 7 6			
1522 Day ,, 3s. ,, ... 228 6 0			
4056 Evening ,, 1s. ,, ... 202 16 0			
	1106	9	6
Guarantee Fund as per list	923	18	0
Donations	151	18	4
Sale of Materials and Sundries	0	16	9
Balance, deficiency still to be raised by further Donations .	36	9	6
	£2219	12	1

PAYMENTS.

	£	s.	d.
By Building, Erecting, Fitting, Decorating, and Lighting the Congress Hall, Sectional Meeting and Committee Rooms, and taking down the Hall (less old Materials sold)	1685	14	2
Insurance	4	0	0
Attendants and Police	47	10	3
Refreshment Department (less old Materials sold) . .	73	2	0
Advertising	97	3	0
Stationery, Printing, Bill-Posting, Tickets, and Stamps .	204	11	2
Congress Service Books	6	1	6
Special Reporting	52	10	0
Mr Wells Gardner, extra matter in the Report . .	49	0	0
	£2219	12	1

T. W. MINTON, TREASURER.

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward,	833	13	0
Vaughan, A. Esq.	2	10	0
Vigers, John, Esq.	1	1	0
Vigers, Thomas, Esq.	2	10	0
Vincent, Rev. W. P.	2	10	0
Walker, C. C., Esq.	5	0	0
Walker, J., Esq.	2	10	0
Walker, R., Esq.	0	10	6
Walley, W. T., Esq.	1	11	6
Walsh, Rev. Prebendary	2	10	0
Warner, John, Esq.	2	10	0
Webber, George, Esq.	2	10	0
Wedgwood, Enoch, Esq.	5	0	0
Wedgwood, Lawrence, Esq.	2	10	0
Carry forward,	£866	16	0

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward,	866	16	0
Whieldon, Rev. E.	2	10	0
Wilbraham, Rev. C. P.	2	10	0
Wilbraham, Randle, Esq.	12	10	0
Wileman, J. F., Esq.	5	0	0
Wilkinson, Rev. F.	2	10	0
Wilkinson, F. S., Esq.	5	0	0
Wood, Edward, Esq.	12	10	0
Wood, E. T. W., Esq.	5	0	0
Woolscroft, Esq. (Chesterton)	0	10	6
Woolley, Messrs L. M., & Son	1	11	6
Worthington, Ernest, Esq.	2	10	0
York, The Very Rev. the Dean of	5	0	0
	£923	18	0

DONORS.

	£	s.	d.
Abraham, Bishop,	1	0	0
Allbut & Daniel, Messrs	3	12	9
Allen, Rev. G.	1	1	0
Austin, Lady,	1	1	0
Balston, Ven. Archdeacon,	1	0	0
Barnes, Rev. J.	2	10	0
Bridgeman, Hon. and Rev. J. O.	2	0	0
Broady, J., Esq.	1	1	0
Caldwell, Bros., Messrs	0	10	6
Challinor, W., Esq.	10	0	0
Challinor, Edward, Esq.	5	0	0
Child, Sir Smith, Bart.	20	0	0
Clayton, Rev. E.	0	10	0
Crewe, Lord,	10	0	0
Devonshire, Duke of	10	0	0
Dimont, Rev. Jas.	5	0	0
Duncalf, Messrs T. & W.	1	0	0
Elliott, P., Esq.	2	2	0
Ewart, Major-General,	2	0	0
Fleet, Brothers, Messrs	1	16	11
Friend, A	1	1	0
Gee, Mr F.	1	1	0
Carry forward,	£83	7	2

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward,	83	7	2
Gray, Mr A. F.	1	0	0
Holdgate, Mr W. M.	1	0	0
Hulme, J., Esq.	0	10	6
Inge, Rev. W.	5	0	0
Kinnear, Mrs Balfour	5	0	0
Kinnersly, Mrs	5	0	0
Lichfield, Bishop of	1	0	0
Lichfield, Cathedral, collection at	25	19	2
Medina, Mr R.	1	1	0
Moore, Mrs	1	1	0
Norman, Rev. D. R.	2	2	0
Perkins, S., Esq.	1	1	0
Pinder, T. S., Esq.	5	0	0
Ringland, H., Esq.	1	1	0
Salmon, Rev. F.	1	1	0
Shrewsbury, Earl of	2	10	0
Turnour, Rev. A. A.	2	2	0
Woolley & Son, Messrs	1	2	6
Wright, G. H. F., Esq.	1	0	0
Wrottesley, Lord	5	0	0
	£151	18	4

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall